Case 1:11-cv-04892-SAS Document 25 Filed 08/29/12 Page 1 of 170

C8DMKADT

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 ADINA KADDEN, 4 Plaintiff, 11 Civ. 4892 (SAS) 5 V. 6 VISUALEX LLC, 7 Defendant. 8 New York, N.Y. 9 August 13, 2012 10:05 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. SHIRA A. SCHEINDLIN, 12 District Judge 13 APPEARANCES 14 MARK RISK 15 Attorney for Plaintiff 16 EPSTEIN BECKER & GREEN Attorneys for Defendant 17 BY: TRAYCEE E. KLEIN MARGARET C. THERING 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

25

settlement.

(Case called) 1 THE COURT: Mr. Risk. 2 3 MR. RISK: Good morning, your Honor, Mark Risk, Mark 4 Risk PC, for the plaintiff. With me is the plaintiff, Adina 5 Kadden. THE COURT: Ms. Klein. 6 7 MS. KLEIN: Good morning, your Honor. From Epstein Becker & Green, representing Visualex, the defendant. 8 9 MS. THERING: Ms. Thering representing Visualex, the 10 defendant. This is a technical aide? 11 THE COURT: 12 MS. KLEIN: This is a technician. And Lillian Romano, 13 the president of Visualex, as well as Gina Pastena from my 14 office. 15 MR. RISK: I should add, your Honor, that's Virginia Hardwick, who is an employment lawyer practicing in New Jersey 16 17 and Pennsylvania, a friend and colleague of mine. 18 THE COURT: Everybody is welcome. It's a public 19 courtroom. 20 We are here to have this nonjury trial because 21 apparently you are unable to settle this case. You really 22 tried to do that. You really tried, folks? 23 MR. RISK: You'll have to ask the defendant, your

It's my sense that defendants are not interested in a

THE COURT: Ms. Klein, did you really try to settle 1 this case? 2 3 MS. KLEIN: We did really try early on. 4 Unfortunately, we are not able to. 5 THE COURT: You didn't try recently? 6 MS. KLEIN: No, we did not speak about settlement 7 recently. THE COURT: Did I send you to a magistrate judge or 8 9 the court-annexed mediation program? 10 MS. KLEIN: You did, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Magistrate judge? 12 MS. KLEIN: I believe we went to the magistrate. I 13 don't recall at the moment who it was, but we did go. 14 MR. RISK: In the fall we had a brief unsuccessful meeting with Magistrate Judge Francis. 15 MS. KLEIN: Correct. 16 17 MR. RISK: To our disappointment. 18 THE COURT: You should have gone back recently. 19 Be that as it may be, if you are not interested, we 20 will do it the slow way. 21 I guess we will have opening statements. Short but to 22 the point. 23 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, before we begin, I would like 24 to just make an application to the Court.

THE COURT: I thought I had all the pretrial motions

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that I am going to have. I set dates for motion in limine. We had them. What kind of application? If it's anything resembling a motion in limine, it's denied. What kind of application.

It is not, your Honor, a motion in limine. MS. KLEIN:

THE COURT: We will see.

In light of the fact it is the defendant's MS. KLEIN: burden, we request that the defendant get to go first.

THE COURT: That's a small point. It's usually pleasant to go last. You want to go first, be my quest.

> MR. RISK: We would like to go first, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am not going to get into that. agree it's her burden of proof to prove an exemption?

MR. RISK: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let her go first. Go ahead.

Ms. Klein, if you want to go first, go first.

MR. RISK: Your Honor, may I raise --

THE COURT: No. Can we get started on an opening statement. We are not going to have a good day if we are going to have just one thing. Your Honor, can I have one more thing? Can we just be heard? No, that's not the way we try cases. try cases with opening statement. All she asked is that she go first because she has the burden of proof.

MR. RISK: Your Honor has ruled. I wanted to ask if we are trying the whole case or just liability today?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The whole case.

MR. RISK: Fine.

THE COURT: Ms. Klein.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, would you like us to have opening statements or just start with the evidence?

THE COURT: Did I not say twice already that I would like to have opening statements? This is maybe the third time. Can we have opening statements now.

MS. KLEIN: Good morning, your Honor.

As you're aware, this case involves whether or not the position of a graphic consultant is an exempt position as that job was performed at Visualex, a company that is located in Dobbs Ferry, New York.

It is the defendant's position on multiple reasons that the job of graphic consultant is an exempt position. believe that the evidence will show that the exemption is applicable for many reasons. It is applicable specifically to Ms. Kadden for the following reasons. Ms. Kadden falls under the administrative exemption. She also falls under the professional exemption under the learned provision, and she also falls under the creative exemption. There is also, as this Court understands, a combination exemption if one doesn't exactly fit.

What matters here is the important facts regarding what was her compensation. She was paid a steady salary. What

Opening - Ms. Klein

were her primary jobs and duty? We believe the evidence will show that her job required her to exercise discretion and judgment, that she exercise creativity and imagination, that she managed both internally and externally, meaning internally the staff at Visualex as well as the clients on the outside, and the expectations when she was doing the consulting work that she was performing.

Your Honor, in summary, this is what this case about.

We then will, of course, if we need to, as has been previously discussed with the Court, address the issues concerning actual hours and good faith. At this point, your Honor, I don't know if you want us to address this. However, we believe that the classification of the consultant is in good faith. According to the Department of Labor, a consultant is an exempt employee, as well as all of the other steps that Visualex took to make sure that in fact the position that Ms. Kadden was performing falls and suggests nothing other than good faith. Also, we believe, if we get to that point, based on the recent decision of the Supreme Court, we also understand that industry practice is relevant to show whether or not it has been treated that way historically.

THE COURT: What Supreme Court case are you referring to?

MS. KLEIN: GlaxoSmithKlein that just came out that talks about the industry and the industry practice and the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Opening - Ms. Klein

Department of Labor's position as to whether or not they take a different position ultimately. But, again, we don't have the situation where there is a different position. The Department of Labor specifically says that a consultant position is exempt. I know that's getting into the legal issues. THE COURT: I want to make sure we are doing the same Is that Christopher v. SmithKlein Beecham, June 18, thing. 2012. That's the case you are referring to? MS. KLEIN: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, at this time we would be ready to proceed, pending, of course, the plaintiff's opening. THE COURT: One moment before we do it. You can have a seat. Your adversary will make a brief opening statement. Mr. Risk. MR. RISK: Your Honor, much of our case comes right off the job description for the position that Ms. Kadden was When we began our case, I'll submit Exhibit 1, which is hired. defendant's admissions in response to our request for admissions, which establishes that Visualex created the job description and that it's an accurate description of the job. Visualex can't make the education prong of the learned profession exemption. The job description is almost from a law

preferred, not required. It gives as examples, e.g., social

school exam. It indicates that a graduate degree was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Opening - Mr. Risk

sciences, law or, et cetera. By its terms, that doesn't make the learned professional exemption.

As you will hear in the testimony, your Honor, Visualex is an unusual workplace. And it's one I would best describe as like a firehouse. They assist lawyers who are trying cases and that means they may sit idly during the day and work very late into the night when lawyers are on trial and creating and revising demonstratives quickly.

The job description, Exhibit 2, is more than theoretical because the evidence will show that Visualex followed it in the people it actually hired for the position.

Kim Matthiesen, who was a graphics consultant in 2006, had a master's degree in English literature, but had very relevant industry experience, which is probably one of the reasons she was hired.

Kim Nawyn had a master's degree and was at the dissertation stage in criminal justice, and she was Ms. Kadden's colleague there.

Ms. Romano, the senior and always graphics consultant there, has a master's degree from Hofstra University in applied research, which really, she will tell us, is industrial psychology, which I understand to be the study of employees and organizations and workplaces.

Heather Moran, who is on call and will come here to testify, was a career paralegal with some graduate courses, but

24

25

Opening - Mr. Risk

1 no graduate degree. So the pattern of hiring does reflect that they meant 2 3 business in this job description. They carried it out exactly. 4 THE COURT: Did all these people earn more or less the 5 same salary? MR. RISK: Their offer letters are more or less 6 7 identical and the salary never changed over five or six years, 75,000 dollars even. 8 9 THE COURT: Moran made it and she made that same 10 salary? 11 MR. RISK: Yes. 12 THE COURT: And Kim Nawyn made it, Moran made it? 13 MR. RISK: And Matthiesen. 14 THE COURT: Matthiesen. 15 MR. RISK: The offer letters, which we will show you, your Honor, are virtually identical, the same template with 16 minor or no deviations, the principal one being that by the 17 18 time Ms. Moran was hired the offer letter no longer explicitly 19 provided for overtime. 20 THE COURT: Still 75? 21 MR. RISK: 75. The only benefit was health insurance, 22 which was 383 a month and the company was paying half of that.

THE COURT: You only addressed one of the three exemptions so far?

MR. RISK: I don't have so much to say, your Honor,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about the other two.

THE COURT: You addressed the learned profession, but you didn't address creative, professional, and administrative.

> I will, your Honor. MR. RISK:

Visualex employs about ten people, all at relevant times, and four or five of them are professional graphics people. There are two job categories. There are graphic designers supervised by art directors. As Visualex will tell you, I think, these are serious people. They are professional graphic artists, the designers are, and, even more so, the art directors who supervise them. They had Adobe Illustrator software and they created the graphics. Ms. Kadden and Ms. Romano don't even have that software on their computer

THE COURT: What do they do?

MR. RISK: Ms. Kadden will testify that her job is to talk to the lawyers about revisions to the graphics, go back to the people in the studio, the designers and art directors, and communicate the revisions, and it goes around and around and around, often late at night, until the final graphics are agreed on. Ms. Kadden interfaces with the lawyers and takes the changes.

There are two consultants assigned to every matter as a matter of Visualex policy. Ms. Romano, whose hourly rate is considerably higher, is typically the senior one, and she goes to the initial meeting with the client and talks about the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

strategy and generally sketches out the prototype of what the graphics will be.

The backup consultant, as Visualex calls it, comes on the revision stage. And there is rounds and rounds of quality control, multiple proofs of the drafts inside Visualex, and then multiple exchanges of the drafts with the client, and the backup consultant, who is often the one working at midnight and 3 in the morning with the trial teams, is the one communicating back and forth between them, communicating back and forth between the lawyers -- should I stop, your Honor?

THE COURT: I have a little emergency. I have to take a phone call. Be right back.

(Recess)

MR. RISK: We were speaking about the creative professional exemption, your Honor. They have artists. she is plainly not one of them. That's what I want to say about that.

Quickly, the administrative exemption. Ms. Kadden is not an administrator. Her job description in her offer letter make it quite clear that she is hired to render services for clients. At Visualex her hours are the service rendered. It's like a law firm. They record time, and your Honor will see the time sheets, and then they send bills to clients. On the production administration dichotomy --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Why does anybody think there is fault under the administrative exemption. You do think so, Ms. Klein?

> MS. KLEIN: Yes, I absolutely do.

THE COURT: Why?

MS. KLEIN: I absolutely do.

THE COURT: Why.

MS. KLEIN: For the reasons that we have previously set forth. For several reasons. One is, she regularly exercised discretion and judgment.

THE COURT: Every employee exercises discretion and judgment, don't they, to some degree?

MS. KLEIN: To some degree you like to think everybody works professionally, but that's understood differently under the federal law. It has a very significant meaning, whether or not she was exercising discretion and judgment of matters of significance to either her employer or the employer's customers. You will see here, again, that as a consultant, which the Department of Labor itself recognizes as an MD administrative exemption, that this is exactly the type of case. She was making recommendations. She was making decisions consistently. This is not the type of job that has ever, ever historically or currently been recognized as one by the Federal Government as one that is a nonexempt position.

THE COURT: I'm really not grasping the administrative

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

exemption. In a recent Ninth Circuit case, the circuit said an administrative employee participates in the running of the business and not merely the day-to-day carrying out of its It's hard to understand that she was running the business, hardly.

MS. KLEIN: And servicing the business' clients.

THE COURT: That's what I'm trying to say. You're losing me on that exemption. Everybody services a client. Let's say you are a law firm, which you are. Everybody, from the receptionist, to the secretaries, to the paralegals, to the lawyers, are servicing the client. That's the purpose of the law firm, is to service the client. I'm not understanding that exemption. I understand the creative one. I understand the learned one. You're really losing the administrative one. You're sort of saying, everybody who is in client services is an administrator.

MS. KLEIN: No, your Honor, I'm not at all saying that.

THE COURT: I'm not getting it. You have to convince one person today.

MS. KLEIN: That's right. And, again, I believe, not to cut off Mr. Risk's opening --

THE COURT: I'm asking you. It's informal. asking you.

> Again, I am absolutely confident that MS. KLEIN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

under the regulations they specifically say that a consultant, which is doing the type of work -- this isn't the dichotomy that Mr. Risk says is a production line. The production line is the artists who are making the demonstrative exhibit that ends up in the courtroom.

When she was doing her job, Ms. Kadden, as well as the other consultant, is looking at something, after interviewing and analyzing extensively complicated patent information, medical backgrounds, expert reports. She is making a recommendation. She admits at her deposition about visually, does this work, does it further my client, the law firm's What it is that they are trying to sell so they can benefit their clients. This is exactly what the statute was written to cover of this type of administrative exemption. She exercised on a daily basis, if she was doing her job, discretion and judgment of matters of significance.

THE COURT: This is the closest call to me. This is the most worrisome one. I don't get this one terribly well. Your adversary is utterly convinced, her passion is convincing, but I don't truly understand the law part of it.

MR. RISK: We are convinced, too, your Honor. Here is why.

> THE COURT: She does exercise judgment, doesn't she?

She does. MR. RISK:

THE COURT: She exercises independent judgment.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

exercises discretion, right?

MR. RISK: We don't think so, your Honor.

THE COURT: Somebody has to decide whether this graphic is communicating what the lawyers want. You said she is not the artist. She is the one who is back and forth between the lawyers and the artists to try to get the concept. So the lawyers explain it to her, then she tells the artist, then she gets a draft, reviews it with the lawyers, go back and forth.

MR. RISK: Your Honor, when your Honor sees the graphics and hears the testimony, we think you'll conclude that her role was extremely limited.

But that takes us away from the administrative exemption because that is hard. It's for people who administer the organization.

THE COURT: You say that. Your adversary doesn't say that at all.

MR. RISK: I know.

THE COURT: She said, look at the regulation, which is one thing I don't have in front of me, is the regulation.

MR. RISK: I know she does, your Honor.

THE COURT: You want to hand it up. You said the regulation.

MS. KLEIN: Yes. I'm happy to provide it. Unfortunately, I have handwritten notes, if you don't mind.

25

1 THE COURT: If you have a clean copy of the 2 regulations. 3 MS. KLEIN: They are also cited in the briefs, the 4 specific sections. 5 I didn't bring the briefs. THE COURT: 6 We will get it for you. MS. KLEIN: 7 THE COURT: Because I realize that she is not managing 8 the company. She is not carrying out the affairs of the 9 company. If that's critical to this exemption, then there is 10 no way she fits in it, period. 11 MS. KLEIN: The regulation says under the administrative exemption under 29 CFR 541.200(22)(c) -- I'll 12 13 read it. To be exempt as a bona fide administrative employee 14 under 29 CFR 541200, all of the following tests must be met. 15 THE COURT: All of the following tests? 16 MS. KLEIN: Right. 17 THE COURT: Is there one about running the company? 18 MS. KLEIN: The three parts. May I read them? The 19 employee must be compensated on a salary basis, salary or fee 20 basis as defined in the regulations at a rate of not less than 21 \$455 a week and then a part --22 THE COURT: She meets that one. 23 MS. KLEIN: I think we do not dispute that.

MR. RISK: I dispute that Ms. Klein is reading from the regulations. I think that's the field operations manual.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have the regulations.

THE COURT: You can read from it.

MR. RISK: I have one copy, your Honor.

That's why I said, you can read from it, THE COURT: if you read slowly.

Section 541.200. The term employee MR. RISK: employed in a bona fide administrative capacity shall mean any employee: Part 2, whose primary duty is the performance of office or nonmanual work directly related to the management or general business operations of an employer or the employer's customers; and, part 3, whose primary duty involves the exercise of discretion and independent judgment.

THE COURT: I think part 3 I'm not worried about.

MR. RISK: If I may continue. 541.201: To qualify for the administrative exemption, an employee's primary duty must be the performance of work directly related to the management and general business operations of the employer or the employer's customers. The phrase directly related to the management or general business operations refers to the type of work performed by the employee. To meet this requirement, an employee must perform work directly related to assisting with the running or servicing of the business as distinguished, for example, from working on a manufacturing and production line or selling a product in retail or service establishment.

> Work directly related to management or general В.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

business operations includes but is not limited to work in functional areas, such as tax, finance, accounting, budgeting, auditing, assurance, quality control, purchasing, procurement, advertising, marking, research, safety and health, personnel management, human resources, employee benefits, labor relations, public relations, government relations, computer network, Internet and database administration, legal and regulatory compliance, and similar activities. Some of these activities may be performed by employees who also would qualify for another exemption.

An employee may qualify for the administrative exemption if the employee's primary duty is the performance of work directly related to the management or general business operations of the employer's customers, which Ms. Klein pointed out; thus, for example, employees acting as advisors or consultants to their employer's clients or customers as tax experts or financial consultants, for example, may be exempt.

Ms. Kadden and her colleagues that are consultants at Visualex did the work that Visualex makes its living from.

THE COURT: She didn't, though. She didn't do the drawing. She is not the graphic artist.

> MR. RISK: But her time was billed by the hour --THE COURT: I know.

She did not have an administrative job MR. RISK: inside Visualex.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I don't know about that. She was the consultant, right, on the graphic design. She interfaced between the lawyers and the artist.

> MR. RISK: Yes.

THE COURT: Just like a tax consultant.

Well, the regulations contemplate that when MR. RISK: an employee renders services for a customer in its internal administration, that might qualify for the administrative exemption. Here, the clients are law firms, the law firms have clients. The Visualex bill presumably ultimately finds its way to the law firm's clients. She is the product or service. time, her hours add product or service rendered by Visualex. She had some small administrative responsibilities inside Visualex, but it's clear she is hired to do billable work.

THE COURT: I don't know that doing billable work exempts you from being classified for the administrative exemption because a tax consultant also bills by the hour. the fact that people bill by the hour doesn't disqualify them from that exemption, from what I'm listening to.

That's right, your Honor. I think if a MR. RISK: consulting firm rendered tax advice to a client, that tax advice is part of the internal administration of the client. Here, the law firm is hiring Visualex, as this gentleman may be hired here today, to render services in connection with its provision of services to its own clients. That's why it's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

nonadministrative.

THE COURT: You might as well finally continue past the three exemptions.

MR. RISK: Well, I think I'll stop there, your Honor. We have briefed -- there is a somewhat complicated legal issue raised by Visualex, which is, if Ms. Kadden is entitled to overtime, it should be computed on the half time method, and I think your Honor may have read a little bit about that in the drafts addressed in the motion in limine. As we have said in the papers, the halftime method has never been used in the Second Circuit. It's been rejected a bunch of times. To say it in plain English, your Honor, it takes the guts of the remedy out of what is a remedial statute.

THE COURT: Why do you think the halftime methodology applies then, Ms. Klein, if it's been repeatedly rejected in the Second Circuit?

MS. KLEIN: It has never been rejected from the Second Circuit.

THE COURT: Why did he say that?

In Second Circuit courts. MR. RISK:

THE COURT: Not the circuit court. He means in district courts in this circuit.

MS. KLEIN: As well as courts have endorsed it, as well as the Department of Labor endorses it as the proper way. And I would also note --

THE COURT: Now you are both saying the Second Circuit has not yet ruled.

MS. KLEIN: I have never addressed it. It has never been put in front of it. The majority of the circuits have adopted, as well as the Department of Labor, which is the agency in charge with enforcing it.

I would also put out there, your Honor, while it's not a direct, in a sense, explicit ruling per se I'm adopting, because I don't want to mislead anything, but your Honor yourself in 2009 in a case called continuing Ting Yao Lin v. Hayashi, it was a case which Magistrate Judge Peck had the issue in front of him on an FLSA case and the calculation there that was endorsed and adopted by your Honor was a halftime rate.

THE COURT: For all I know, there was not even an objection.

MS. KLEIN: Of course, but I am sure.

THE COURT: In other words, if he did a report and recommendation and there was no objection, of course I adopted it. It doesn't mean I gave it any thought. I'm saying it's Judge Peck's opinion. If there was no objection, that's it.

MR. RISK: Were the Second Circuit or were your Honor to decide there might be a case that is appropriate for application of the halftime method, it wouldn't be this case.

The case law on halftime method suggests it begins

with an understanding between the employer and an employee. There was an understanding between Visualex and Ms. Kadden set forth in a signed offer letter, dated May of 2008, and it said explicitly — that's going to be Exhibit 3 — explicitly you'll be paid time and a half, overtime, time and a half after 40 hours. The pay stubs, which we will introduce as Exhibit 5, indicate during that period regular rate, \$36; overtime rate, \$54. So the documentary trail shows that the time and a half method was used.

It's true that in March of 2009, Visualex told Ms.

Kadden that it wasn't going to pay any more overtime. And I suppose, I suppose there was an understanding in the loosest sense, to the extent that when the employer says I'm not paying that anymore, she heard what they said. It would be a poor case for application of the halftime method. I am going to stop there, your Honor.

THE COURT: I would like you to address the last point, which is liquidated damages.

Is she entitled to liquidated damages?

MR. RISK: Yes.

THE COURT: That's the last one.

MR. RISK: Your Honor addressed that, as your Honor may recall, in the motion in limine, and there is some history that goes with that.

Your Honor can give us some guidance on how the Court

would like us to proceed here. The deposition testimony from Ms. Romano says, I've been around the industry and I didn't think consultants — what she said was, I thought they are salaried. I knew that and I did a Google search and it took me to the Department of Labor. I don't remember it so well now, but I concluded that I didn't have to pay the overtime.

And then there is the issue about advice of counsel. We were here in March and your Honor ruled not to disclose the documents and now it's been revisited. I don't know if your Honor wants — the documents have not been disclosed. I don't know how your Honor wants to proceed.

THE COURT: Depends if they rely on the advice of counsel. I said if they do that at trial, they have to disclose that.

MR. RISK: Our position is that we are entitled to liquidated damages. We are a little in the dark. We don't think that the testimony that we have heard so far is unequivocal enough as to what was done. We don't know what happened or whether they will rely on advice of counsel, and we remind the Court, we think in view of all of the facts of this case and the way the overtime was withdrawn, we would hope the Court would exercise its discretion to award the liquidated damages, even upon a finding of good faith and reasonable basis, which discretion the Court has. The statute reads, your Honor, that in the event the finding of good faith and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reasonable basis is made, the Court has discretion to award liquidated damages in no amount or in any amount up to 100 percent.

> THE COURT: Is there some issue about an offset?

MS. KLEIN: Yes.

MR. RISK: Yes.

What's that last issue about an offset? THE COURT:

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, before we move on, may I address one thing, because I want to know how the Court would like us to proceed.

In the decision in the motion in limine and I believe at the earlier, one of the conferences that we had, I understood that we were not going to get to the issue of the good faith, the attorney-client until you made a decision as to whether or not the position was exempt. You had suggested that it would be an informally sort of bifurcated, let's see whether or not the position falls within an exemption. And if it does not, that we would then be faced with the situation, if we want to put on the evidence about good faith --

THE COURT: But half an hour ago Mr. Risk asked if we were bifurcating. I didn't want to formally bifurcate. have to recall witnesses. But if you want me to rule orally and quickly at some point about these exemptions -- otherwise, I would have to take a break for two weeks and write a learned opinion, call you back and do damages. I don't want to go

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

through all that. If you want some quick read on these exemptions, I'll give it to you before you make that decision. But I don't want to recall witnesses. They are going to have to testify pretty much about everything anyway, so it's tricky.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, may I ask something. This is sort of food for thought. We are scheduled to be here --

> THE COURT: Three days.

MS. KLEIN: Exactly, until Wednesday. And two primary witnesses are going to be here the whole time. Depending, I quess, on how fast we can move along today and tomorrow, if it was just on the issue about the work that was actually done, I would not be opposed, I don't know if Mr. Risk is, I don't want to unnecessarily waste the Court's time with the offset. back pay is tedious going through week by weeks of descriptions of work which we may never have to get to.

> What's the offset issue? THE COURT:

MS. KLEIN: The offset issue involves essentially the fact that not only the base salary, let's put that aside, that she was paid significantly more than any of the nonexempts, but even as having her base salary of 75,000, there were many things that she received because of the understanding that she was exempt, which was, for example, comp days, paid time off, other things that she would not otherwise have gotten.

There was also improper characterizations in her time sheet where she characterized things. For example, as, you

know, a sick day, but it was having her car fixed.

amount. But having now had an opportunity --

Unfortunately, as a result of this litigation we have gone through them. And when she ultimately left the company, she was given, what was the company's policy. If you have accrued unused vacation, you were given a check to represent that

THE COURT: Is that true for exempts and nonexempts?

They both get the vacation pay?

MS. KLEIN: Yes. Any accrued unused time --

THE COURT: Both of them get that.

MS. KLEIN: Yeah. But the issue is, she was overpaid. She was paid vacation which was not truly vacation. She was fully responsible, Ms. Kadden, in inputting her own time, characterizing it as whatever she wanted, consulting, quality control client revisions. She characterized her time. And basically the way a small company works, I'm sure your Honor is familiar, is, it's somewhat of good faith and they push a button and it calculates and it said she has vacation. She was handed a check for 54 hours of vacation or approximately.

In fact, she wasn't entitled to it because she had not been putting in her time correctly. She was calling it sick, which gave her more vacation left in a pot, when in fact she didn't have it.

Our only point on the offset, and I'm hoping we don't have to get there, if the Court is going to decide that she is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

nonexempt, which we don't agree with, if it does, that equity and fairness would mean that everybody be put --

THE COURT: How much money are we talking about on the offset issue?

MS. KLEIN: Around \$4,000, I believe. The whole amount isn't that much. If we apply the halftime method --

THE COURT: I suggested at the outset that we all get our three days back and settle the case. You apparently are not interested.

MS. KLEIN: Can I share with you why we can't do it, if you have any desire to know? This is only about Ms. Kadden. This is an entire industry that qualifies, graphic consultant We have other employees. This is not a sole as exempt. plaintiff. It's much bigger than that.

How can Visualex function as a business, not knowing? It's following what it believes the Department of Labor said. How can it function and live and go forward when there is this hanging over them? If they pay her, it's an unanswered question. And we have all these other people that are behind us. We have New York statutes of limitations. There is a lot more at stake. You know what, even if you rule that she is nonexempt, better to know but the Department of Labor says one thing and if this Court believes differently, you know what, the business owners can't function if they don't know. unfortunately, it's not the number. It's just not.

1 THE COURT: What are you saying that the Department of 2 Labor says? 3 MS. KLEIN: That consultants are exempt employees. 4 THE COURT: Consultants, no matter what kind of 5 consultant, no matter what kind of business, all consultants? 6 MS. KLEIN: Of course it uses that as the example and 7 then it sets forth in the regs the examples and you have to meet the test, the primary duty matters of significance. 8 9 THE COURT: Which exemption is that? MS. KLEIN: The administrative. We are not sticking 10 11 on a label. We are not saying that she was -- she doesn't disagree that she was a consultant. It would be one thing if I 12 13 called you a consultant, but I really had you acting as a 14 janitor. Titles don't mean anything in that way. We don't 15 dispute the work she was doing, nor did she. She admitted at her deposition all of the matters of significance. 16 17 MR. RISK: 18

There are a number of things to address, your Honor. Titles don't mean anything under the FLSA. Duties do.

THE COURT: Your adversary agrees with that.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RISK: We are going to put on a case about that. To say that consultants are exempt or nonexempt is not really the language --

THE COURT: Your adversary agrees. It depends on the job duties. But generally, nonetheless, the Department of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Labor seems to say consultants then defined.

MS. KLEIN: It says acting as an advisor or consultant.

If an employee gives advice on the MR. RISK: administrative functions of a customer, that might be the same as administering in the home company.

THE COURT: We talked about that because I told you that's the most difficult one for me apparently, really just became confirmed in this last minute or so of colloquy. is the one that's confusing, you said, because the Department of Labor uses the word consultant as exempt, depending on the This is the trickiest of the three, I think. duties.

MS. KLEIN: Also, one of the things that may help hopefully crystallize it for everyone is, think about it. A law firm, what do we do? Our business, right, is hopefully winning cases for our client, whichever side that may be. If I am acting as a consultant in advising Skadden Arps, whatever law firm, on how to do a better job so that they will have a better result for their client, I am rendering advice to them on how to do it better. That is exactly, again, what the Department of Labor has addressed. This isn't unique. It's not something unusual.

MR. RISK: It's not what the Department of Labor has addressed at all. If someone were advising Skadden Arps on its matching information systems --

THE COURT: That's running the business. I see that one. That's running the business of Skadden Arps, sure.

MR. RISK: That's where the administrative exemption goes.

I would like to speak on this offset issue because there is no issue, and we have briefed it very carefully. This is not the first employer in the history of the FLSA to come in and say, even if we owe overtime, we paid some other money, the statute and the regs are clear about what can be offset. I don't think there is -- I didn't hear from Ms. Klein nor seen in the papers any statutory basis for this claim of offset.

The time sheets that we are hearing about are Visualex's time records. Ms. Kadden entered time which was reviewed by Visualex and its bills were sent to clients based on that. The idea that we are going to put Ms. Kadden on the stand and ask her what she did on a Thursday three years ago, it's not right and there is no authority for it. Even in courts that have allowed an offset where the payment is a premium pay payment, often that's limited to a premium payment during the same pay period that the claim of overtime is for. There is no legal basis for that at all.

More importantly, your Honor, in connection with the submission of the pretrial order, we went back and forth with defendant's counsel and I think we reached an agreement, and it involved me modifying my calculation of the numbers. I thought

we reached an agreement, which I have set forth in an e-mail, that the productive working hours at issue here are 416.7 hours, and I thought that's the one fact that we resolved.

THE COURT: Have we resolved it?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, what the documents show and what we have agreed is that plaintiff is claiming there are 416 hours of overtime that based on looking at those time sheets and you add them up and you are correct, we worked on some that clearly were not and should not have been in there, we have reached the number of 416.

In regards to the issue of the premium pay and things of that sort, if I can just address one other thing, not to make this so legalese at this point, the Department of Labor as well as numerous circuit courts have also addressed and adopted not only the halftime method, but also the prepayment method, which says that if you take somebody that is improperly classified and they were being paid as an exempt employee along the way, every paycheck, 1500, 1500, there is no deductions or anything like that, and it's then determined that it wasn't correct, the extra money and the things that they received are allowed to basically be considered prepayment going towards the overtime. This isn't supposed to be a windfall. If we are saying that Ms. Kadden was hourly, as she is claiming, then, again, she should have been treated that way. This is not meant to be anything more than making sure she got the wages

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

she was supposed to get. She can't take from here.

THE COURT: She can't have it both ways. understand.

> MS. KLEIN: That's right. That's all we are saying.

THE COURT: She is entitled to overtime.

MS. KLEIN: One or the other.

THE COURT: Then she wasn't entitled.

MS. KLEIN: To the benefit of being an exempt. You get to come in at 11:00, you get paid the same salary because there is no deduction, or you leave, as she writes in her notes, on her calendar, it's a gorgeous day, leaves at 1:30, that's nice, but that comes with being a professional because you know you could get your work done.

MR. RISK: What I don't think there is a basis for, and I hope we are not going to spend thousands of dollars in professional time and this Court's time going over Ms. Kadden's recollection of time sheets that were submitted to and accepted by Visualex three years ago, because she will have no recollection of what she did on a Thursday three years ago.

Not to talk about settlement, but Ms. Klein did, the problem -- I don't really understand why a typical nonadmission settlement agreement would create a problem for Visualex. would think it would help them. But, your Honor, the problem at this stage, as your Honor has alluded to, is it's a modest claim, but it's under the federal statute and we have spent a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

year now of professional time that we tried to head off last fall. That's the problem. But we are here.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, may I say one other thing. We are talking sort of mixing between openings and facts and law and stuff.

While Mr. Risk says this is a modest dollar amount. THE COURT: It is. But you said it's bigger than that.

MS. KLEIN: That's right. What I think that this case has boiled down to, and I think the parties -- Mr. Risk admitted it the first time we were in front of your Honor, this part of it isn't in dispute. Ms. Kadden was hired. Visualex had at that time the ability to give incentive compensation in the form of overtime to its professional staff. You'll hear the reasons why they did that, for a good reason, to treat employees a certain way. She was an hourly employee. didn't have an employment contract. There came a point in time in 2009 where it couldn't be.

Either everyone was going to be laid off or nobody would have food to put on the table for their families and money coming in, or they were able to make a decision. were able to look to see where are we spending money that we either don't need to or we can't afford to right now, but legally still within the realm of legality.

Hourly employees were never changed. They still

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

receive overtime to this day. I understand, if Ms. Kadden is disappointed she accepted a job and somewhere along the way it changed, I get that. The alternative was laying her off. And when it was announced that at this point we can no longer pay the professionals this, and this will be your salary going forward, if things get better, we are the first ones, Visualex, that want to, if we can do it, we want to share the wealth. But we are tightening our belts and therefore you have to. And when she stays and continues to work there, it changes.

Again, it's no different than -- I know many lawyers and many professionals that in the difficult times of 2009, 2010 took rollbacks in their salary. That happens. And this is not, although I think it was meant to be started as, a breach of contract claim. And that's what this case comes down to. Ms. Kadden didn't receive overtime. She considered herself exempt when she did the exact same job at Doar. Why are we here? It's because there was a change. I agree it might have been -- yeah, it stinks, I get that.

MR. RISK: Well, your Honor, I am not sure what kind of argument that is.

THE COURT: I understood what it is.

MR. RISK: It needs a response.

THE COURT: Oh, really.

MR. RISK: She didn't do the exact same job at Doar. We are just asking the Court to apply the law.

Back to that firehouse I was telling your Honor about, where they sit often idly and then work late at night serving trial teams at trial. After 6:00, Visualex increases by 50 percent the consultant's hourly rate. Ms. Kadden's hourly rate was 225. I think that makes it 337.50. This is a job where midnight is quite common. If it's a trial, midnight night after night, 3 in the morning. Whether Visualex is rich or poor, I don't know. I know they do big matters for some of the best-known law firms in the world. I hear them claiming poverty. I don't know.

We are here asking the Court to apply the law and recognize that the hours at issue here, Visualex is making a lot of money on Ms. Kadden's time. And she was paid \$54 an hour and that's what we are seeking for the hours.

THE COURT: Ms. Klein.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, may I just, before we start the direct, can we take a two-minute break and start with our first witness. Is that okay?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Recess)

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, just as a housekeeping matter, we had delivered down to the Court all of the exhibits. You are like, what do I need them for?

THE COURT: No. I don't know where we put them.

MS. KLEIN: We have two big binders that were

1 delivered to the Court.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: When?

MS. KLEIN: Friday. They are around this big.

THE COURT: Whatever. Two big binders. We will look around. We would have brought them down if we found them, but I am sure -- not sure. They may have arrived after the mailroom made its last delivery, which means it would not have been made until the morning delivery and the morning delivery is around 11:30.

MR. RISK: I have two books to hand you. Should I do that now or later?

THE COURT: Later. Those are your books.

They came on Friday?

MS. KLEIN: They were hand-delivered around 2:00.

THE COURT: You think they were hand-delivered at

2:00, two binders?

MS. KLEIN: On Friday.

Your Honor, while that's going on, if I can just share something with you. So some of the exhibits, as you can see from the amount of paper that are on our tables, are very extensive. I will not be using all of them.

So what I have done, to just try to make this go faster for everyone, is the exhibits that are the ones that are hundreds and hundreds of pages I have selected out the pages that we are using and bound them, just to make it easier for

They are part of this. And if that's okay with 1 everyone, I made a copy for everyone. 2 3 THE COURT: That's fine. 4 MS. KLEIN: That I think will make this go faster. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MS. KLEIN: We will find out where specifically it was 7 We are going to call our mailroom, who brought it down. left. I have extra copies as we go through. 8 9 THE COURT: Who is the first witness? 10 MS. KLEIN: You are ready, your Honor? 11 THE COURT: Yes. 12 MS. KLEIN: At this time I would like to call Lillian 13 Romano to the stand, your Honor. 14 LILLIAN ROMANO, 15 called as a witness by the Defendant, having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 16 17 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, may I just ask, since we are not in front of a jury, how you want to run things. We have 18 19 the exhibits. When I am going to offer them, if we can show 20

them on the projector, if that's okay with you so we are all looking at the same thing.

> THE COURT: Sure. I don't have the exhibit set yet.

MS. KLEIN: I do. And I have extra copies of most.

If not, we will have that and I can replace them.

21

22

23

24

25

I hope we get them in the next half hour. THE COURT:

C8DMKADT

- 1 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 2 | BY MS. KLEIN:
- 3 Q. Good morning, Ms. Romano.
- 4 | A. Yes.
- 5 | Q. Are you currently employed?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. Can you tell me where you're currently employed?
- 8 A. Visualex LLC.
- 9 Q. What is your profession?
- 10 A. I'm a graphics consultant.
- 11 | Q. How long have you worked as a litigation graphics
- 12 | consultant?
- 13 A. A little over 20 years.
- 14 | Q. Can you briefly tell us your professional background?
- 15 | A. I started as a graphics consultant at Litigation Sciences
- 16 back in 1990. I was there for about five years. And then I
- 17 | took a position as a graphics consultant at Pixel. I was there
- 18 | for about ten months. And then I went to FTI Consulting, and I
- 19 | was a graphics consultant there until end of 1999, at which
- 20 point I started Visualex.
- 21 | Q. As a result of your professional background that you just
- 22 | testified, are you familiar with the industry?
- 23 | A. Yes, very.
- 24 | Q. In your years of experience in the industry, are litigation
- 25 graphic consultants known by any other titles?

- 1 A. A lot of different companies give different titles. They
- 2 | all mean the same thing. It could be a trial graphics
- 3 consultant, a communication consultant, a trial consultant.
- 4 There is a lot of different nomenclature, but it all means the
- 5 same thing.
- 6 Q. Have you personally ever held the title trial graphic
- 7 | consultant?
- 8 A. That's the function I perform, but I have always called it
- 9 graphics consultant.
- 10 | Q. And can you explain to the Court -- let me ask you. You
- 11 | said that you started Visualex. That's your company?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 | Q. And are you the sole owner?
- 14 A. No. There are three owners.
- 15 Q. Can you tell us --
- 16 | THE COURT: When did you start it?
- 17 THE WITNESS: The end of 1999.
- 18 THE COURT: Who are the other two owners.
- 19 THE WITNESS: Brian Fennessy is the creative director
- 20 and vice-president, and then we have just an investment
- 21 partner, which was actually my brother, Joseph Romano.
- 22 | THE COURT: Thank you.
- 23 | Q. Can you tell us, Ms. Romano, what is Visualex in its most
- 24 | basic form?
- 25 A. In its most basic form we are a litigation support company.

- 1 Q. Does Visualex specialize in anything in particular?
- A. Yes. We specialize in providing visual presentations in conjunction with litigation.
- 4 | Q. And generally who are Visualex's clients?
- A. Generally, it's the law firm, but there are times that we actually work directly with the ultimate client. But generally it's the law firm.
 - Q. Throughout the history of Visualex, just for purposes of make it simpler, has the general format of the business remained the same?
- 11 A. Yes.

8

9

10

12

13

14

17

18

24

- Q. And what I would really like you to focus on is if there is a difference between the time when Ms. Kadden was there to today.
- What are the different job titles at Visualex during the time in question?
 - A. Consultants, art directors, designers, production coordinator, director of motion graphics, and bookkeeper.
- 19 | Q. And what is the primary job of the consultants?
- A. The primary job of the consultants is to review and analyze case materials and to create and develop the most effective visual strategy to help the trial teams communicate their case to the trier of fact.
 - Q. And in your experience did graphic consultants have any specialized areas of education?

- 1 Α. Yes.
- 2 And what are they? Q.
- A postgraduate degree, social sciences, or a JD. 3
- postgraduate degree, really. 4
- 5 When you say JD, just for the record, can you tell us what
- you are referring to? 6
- 7 They are a lawyer.
- In 2008, were you aware of any individuals that worked in 8
- 9 your profession as a graphics consultant that did not have an
- 10 advanced educational degree?
- 11 Α. No.
- 12 In your opinion, if you can just explain for us, what is
- 13 the interplay or the relevance between these various areas of
- 14 the law, whether it's the psychology and the relevance of the
- background? 15
- MR. RISK: Object to the form of the question. 16
- 17 THE COURT: It's compound. Is that what you object
- 18 to?
- Compound, vague, confusing. 19 MR. RISK:
- 20 THE COURT: I don't know about any vaque or confusing,
- 21 but it's certainly compound.
- 22 In your opinion, what is the interplay between psychology
- 23 of the law and the job of graphic consultant?
- 24 The law aspect of it, obviously, if you are familiar with
- the legal industry and you kind of know how it works, that's 25

- 1 | always an advantage. You are going to be dealing with lawyers.
- 2 Obviously, if you have some knowledge of how the legal industry
- 3 works, that's very helpful. From the psychology side of it,
- 4 because what you are trying to do is to craft a presentation
- 5 that most effectively communicates very complex concepts, what
- 6 you have to understand and be aware of is human learning
- 7 | theory, how people assimilate information. That's how you know
- 8 different ways that would make the visual presentation more
- 9 | impactful.
- 10 | Q. Do you have an advanced degree?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. In what?
- 13 A. Applied research and evaluation, psychology.
- 14 | Q. In the time when you started in the industry, had you
- 15 | already had an advanced degree?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. You mentioned before that your first job as a graphic
- 18 consultant, if I remember correctly, was Litigation Sciences,
- 19 | Inc.?
- 20 A. Correct.
- 21 Q. Is that also referred to as anything else?
- 22 A. Yes. It's LSI.
- 23 Q. So LSI and Litigation Science is one in the same?
- 24 | A. Right.
- 25 | Q. Would you have been hired by LSI if you did not have an

C8DMKADT Romano - direct

- 1 | advanced degree?
- 2 A. No.
- 3 \mathbb{Q} . Why is that?
- 4 A. It was required.
- 5 Q. Do you know of anyone at LSI that worked as a graphic
- 6 consultant that did not have an advanced degree?
- 7 A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
- 8 Q. What was your primary duty as a graphic consultant at LSI?
- 9 A. It's the same as what it is, as I sit here today, as a
- 10 graphic consultant for Visualex. It is to review case
- 11 materials, analyze them, and come up with the most effective
- 12 | visual strategy to advance the client's case and obviously help
- 13 | them to get a win for their client.
- 14 | Q. Were graphics consultants considered exempt employees at
- 15 | LSI?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Do graphic consultants receive overtime at LSI?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 | Q. After you left LSI, you joined a company called Pixel, is
- 20 | that correct?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. Are you aware of anyone at Pixel that worked as a
- 23 | litigation graphic consultant that did not have an advanced
- 24 | degree?
- 25 A. No.

- Q. What was your primary duty as a graphic consultant at Pixel?
- A. Consultant, as a consultant. It's the same as it always was. It was to review the case materials and to develop the
- 5 most strategic visual presentation for clients.
- Q. And were graphic consultants considered exempt employees at Pixel?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Did graphic consultants receive overtime at Pixel?
- 10 | A. No.

8

- 11 | Q. After you left Pixel you said you joined FTI?
- 12 A. Correct.
- Q. Would you have been hired by FTI if you did not have an advanced degree?
- 15 | A. No.
- 16 MR. RISK: Objection. Lack of foundation.
- THE COURT: Well, right, if you didn't make that

 objection when the same question was asked as to LSI, I

 wondered if you would. Because she is saying would you have

 been hired. You could ask it differently. Were all the

 graphic consultants there, did all of them have advanced
- 22 degrees?
- THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 24 | THE COURT: Did any of them get overtime?
- 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

- 1 THE COURT: That you can ask.
- 2 MS. KLEIN: Thank you, your Honor.
- 3 Again, not to be repetitive, just to make it clear for the 4 record, what was your primary duties and responsibility as a
 - Again, same responsibilities, to review the case materials and to develop strategic visual presentations.
 - Since Visualex has opened its doors, how many graphic consultants have worked for the company?
 - Nine, including myself. Α.
- 11 Can you tell us who they are?

graphic consultant at FTI?

- 12 In addition to myself, there was Ted Gipstein; Chip,
- 13 we call him Chip, but his name was Theodore walker; Marilyn.
- 14 Wesel, Kim Nawyn, Nicole Matthiesen, Adina Kadden, David Mykel,
- 15 and Heather Moran.
- Did Mr. Gipstein have an advanced degree at the time that 16
- 17 Visualex hired him?
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 Do you know what his advanced degree was? Q.
- 20 Yes. A JD. Α.
- 21 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, if I can have the witness or 22 if I can hand it up, have her look at what's been premarked as
- 23 Exhibit AA.
- 24 May I approach, your Honor?
- 25 MR. RISK: Your Honor, Exhibit AA was not included in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Romano - direct

the joint pretrial order. I did get it a week ago. And I won't object to this one.

MS. KLEIN: Can you see it, your Honor?

THE COURT: Sort of. What I can't see is probably not important, like his address. I don't see his address.

MS. KLEIN: I have it. Would you like it?

THE COURT: All right.

- Q. Ms. Romano, have you seen this document before?
- A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And what is it, please?
- 11 A. It's the résumé of Ted Gipstein.
- 12 | Q. Is this document part of Visualex's business records?
- 13 A. Yes.
- Q. And was it maintained in the ordinary course of Visualex's business?

THE COURT: I am never going to allow this in as a business record. You don't even have to lay the foundation.

He is not objecting. That's the end of it. It's not a business record. It's the man's résumé. He wrote it, I

assume. Mr. Gipstein wrote it, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: The fact that it's maintained, remember the business record exception made in the regular course of business. It is not the regular course of her business to write other people's résumés. Let's all be learned about the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

business record exemption.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, it was maintained in the ordinary course.

THE COURT: It doesn't matter. It has to be made and kept in the ordinary course. This could never be a business record. You know that now, right. I'm glad I've been helpful. Now you now about the business records exception.

MS. KLEIN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: There is no objection. It's received.

(Defendant's Exhibit AA received in evidence)

- Ο. Does Exhibit AA reflect Mr. Gipstein's advanced degree?
- 12 A. Yes.
 - MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, you said it's already been admitted.

THE COURT: Yes. From the moment he didn't object, AA was received. Yes, the man went to law school. And graduated, I assume. JD, there it is.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I'd like to hand the witness what has been premarked as Defendant's Exhibit CC.

THE COURT: Are you going to object to CC, Mr. Risk?

MR. RISK: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: CC is received.

(Defendant's Exhibit CC received in evidence)

THE COURT: What's CC?

MS. KLEIN: It's Bates stamped VIS 2001 and VIS 2002.

1 THE COURT: It's a letter from Mr. Gipstein to Ms. 2 Romano? 3 MS. KLEIN: Yes. It's a cover letter. 4 THE COURT: Why is it being offered? I know it's 5 received because there is no objection. Why are we getting it? 6 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, it's relevant to showing the 7 interplay between law and the JD and the job of a graphic consultant. 8 9 THE COURT: I don't think it's relevant to any of It's his letter saying, hire me, I'm good. I quickly 10 that. 11 understand legal issues and client objectives. Good. That's 12 his self promotion. That's fine. 13 Did you hire this guy? 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. 15 THE COURT: When did he start, roughly? THE WITNESS: In the early 2000s. 16 17 THE COURT: Is he still there? 18 THE WITNESS: No. 19 THE COURT: How long did he stay? 20 THE WITNESS: About three years. He had a stroke, 21 unfortunately. 22 MS. KLEIN: If we are not going to go over that --23 THE COURT: We are not going over it. This letter is 24 not important. Go ahead. 25 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, if I may, just for the record,

TADT Romano - direct

say it is important for the purposes --1 2 THE COURT: The ruling is, it's not important to me, 3 so we need to move on. I don't need reargument on each 4 rejected idea. I already took the exhibit. It's in the 5 record. I'm telling you, it's of no weight to me. I don't 6 care what he said about himself. I get it. He's a lawyer and 7 that's going to help him do his job. I get it. MS. KLEIN: May I have Exhibit Y. 8 9 THE COURT: Do you object to Exhibit Y? 10 MR. RISK: Let me find it. 11 THE COURT: Take a minute, find it, tell me whether 12 you object. 13 MS. KLEIN: It's the résumé of Theodore Walker. 14 MR. RISK: No objection. THE COURT: Y is received. 15 (Defendant's Exhibit Y received in evidence) 16 17 THE COURT: I see this person has a JD from Cardoza 18 law school in a year I can't read from here. 19 Q. Did Mr. Walker have an advanced degree --20 THE COURT: You are going to have to stay with me. 21 I'm fast. He has got a JD from Cardoza law school in 1986. 22 You don't have to ask her if this person has an advanced 23 degree, because I just said it. 24 Did you end up hiring Walker?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

1	THE COURT: When did you hire him, roughly?
2	THE WITNESS: In 2005.
3	THE COURT: And how long did he stay?
4	THE WITNESS: He stayed for about a year.
5	THE COURT: Was he a graphics consultant?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, he was.
7	MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I'd like the witness to next
8	look at Exhibit Y.
9	THE COURT: This was Y?
10	MS. KLEIN: I'm sorry.
11	THE COURT: Y was received. It's in the record.
12	MS. KLEIN: Exhibit X.
13	THE COURT: Any objection to X?
14	MS. KLEIN: It's the résumé of Marilyn Wesel.
15	MR. RISK: No objection.
16	THE COURT: Marilyn Wesel's résumé, that one I can't
17	read on the screen.
18	This person also has a JD from the University of
19	Cincinnati College of Law 1993, right?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes.
21	THE COURT: And was a general counsel and a magistrate
22	in state court?
23	THE WITNESS: Yes.
24	THE COURT: You hired this person?
25	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

T Romano - direct

THE COURT: Roughly when?

THE WITNESS: Roughly in -- I am not exactly sure. It was after Chip left, so it must have been like 2006, around there.

THE COURT: How long did this person stay, roughly?

THE WITNESS: About a year.

- Q. Ms. Romano, Kim Nawyn also worked as a graphic consultant?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And did she have an advanced degree?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And do you recall as you sit here today what her advanced degree was in?
- 13 A. Yes. In criminal justice.
- 14 | Q. Do you know what degree she had?
- 15 A. Master's degree.
- MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I'd like to move to admit
- 17 Defendant's Exhibit W.
- 18 MR. RISK: No objection.
- 19 | THE COURT: W is received.
- 20 | (Defendant's Exhibit W received in evidence)
- 21 MS. KLEIN: Would you like a copy of it, your Honor?
- 22 | THE COURT: Sure.
- 23 Q. And you hired Ms. Nawyn?
- 24 | A. Yes, I did.

25

Q. And did you hire her in part because of her advanced

- 1 | degree?
- 2 A. Yes, I did.
- 3 | Q. And was there any other relevant experience that she had
- 4 | which made her a desirable candidate for Visualex?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 0. And what is that?
- 7 A. She was a professor, which obviously was very helpful
- 8 because our job as consultant is to teach juries and judges
- 9 sometimes very complex information. So it's all about
- 10 | teaching.
- 11 | Q. Ms. Romano, Nicole Matthiesen, she was also a graphic
- 12 | consultant?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. And she had an advanced degree?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. And do you recall, as you sit here now, what her advanced
- 17 degree was?
- 18 | A. Yes. She had a master's in English literature, I believe.
- 19 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I would move to have
- 20 | Defendant's Exhibit Z admitted, the résumé of Nicole
- 21 | Matthiesen.
- 22 MR. RISK: No objection.
- 23 THE COURT: Z is received.
- 24 | (Defendant's Exhibit Z received in evidence)
- MS. KLEIN: May I approach?

- THE COURT: You don't need to ask. It's a nonjury 1 trial. 2
- 3 Q. Up until this last résumé, are all of these graphic consultants that were hired before Ms. Kadden? 4
 - Α. Yes.

5

6

7

8

- And were all of the graphic consultants that we just went through hired to perform the same duties?
- Α. Yes.
- And what was their primary duty and responsibility?
- 10 Primary duty and responsibility of a graphics consultant is 11 to review case materials and to come up with the most effective 12 strategic presentation of key case facts and to buttress any 13 case weaknesses to help our clients help their clients to win
- 14 their case.
- 15 Q. Do the graphic consultants manage anyone at Visualex?
- 16 Α. Yes.
- 17 And who do they manage? Q.
- 18 Α. Everyone.
- 19 THE COURT: What does that mean? They don't manage 20 you.
- 21 THE WITNESS: I'm a graphic consultant.
- 22 THE COURT: You're also the head of the firm. Who do 23 the other graphic consultants manage?
- 24 THE WITNESS: They manage the studio staff. 25 graphic consultant is the one who is developing the individual

Α.

Romano - direct

graphics, and then they have to convey what the takeaway needs 1 2 to be and what needs to be done to the studio who actually 3 executes the layout. They have to tell the production 4 coordinator what needs to go out when and what order, who it 5 needs to be sent to, those kinds of things. They are basically 6 the one pulling the strings to get the case through the door. 7 THE COURT: When you say manage, is that like a direct Could they say to such an employee, no, you can't take 8 9 off tomorrow? 10 THE WITNESS: Yes. Because when you're managing --11 THE COURT: Do they hire those people? 12 THE WITNESS: I make all the final hiring decisions. 13 But when we are looking for consultants, they are always 14 interviewed by the other consultants because we are working so 15 closely. THE COURT: I'm talking about the graphic artists, the 16 17 ones that produce the drawings, do they hire them? 18 THE WITNESS: No. 19 THE COURT: Do they fire them? 20 THE WITNESS: No. 21 THE COURT: Do they write out employee reviews with 22 them? 23 THE WITNESS: No. 24 Does Visualex have a formal review process?

They are supposed to be, but we are such a small

- business -- there is supposed to be a yearly review, but it rarely happens, just because there is other things going on.
- 3 Q. Is trial graphics a recognized professional field?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Do you know for how many years it's been a recognized
- 6 | field?
- 7 A. It started -- LSI was the first one to ever use graphics at
- 8 | a trial, and I believe it was an explosion of a sewer line in
- 9 Louisville, Kentucky, and that was in the early '80s.
- 10 | Q. And is there a professional association for litigation
- 11 graphic consultants?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 | O. And what is that?
- 14 A. It's called ASTC, the American Society of Trial
- 15 | Consultants. It's all trial consultants, jury consultants, and
- 16 graphics consultants participate.
- 17 Q. Had Visualex consultants been featured speakers for any
- 18 | legal and social science organizations?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Can you tell me where?
- 21 | A. A lot of different engagements, the American Bar
- 22 | Association, Practicing Law Institute, American Society of
- 23 | Corporate Counsel, all -- we do a lot of education and
- 24 presentations, CLE courses, those kinds of things.
- 25 | Q. Have you written about your profession?

C8DMKADT

- Α. Yes.
- 2 And have you been published? Q.
- 3 Yes. Α.

- 4 And can you tell us where you've been published? Q.
- 5 The National Law Journal, I think twice, and then the
- 6 Massachusetts Lawyer, which I think got picked up by a bunch of
- 7 other trade publications.
- Q. Did there come a time in 2008 that Visualex was looking to 8
- 9 hire a new graphic consultant?
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 What steps did Visualex take, if any, to fill the position?
- 12 We retained a few headhunters. I believe we put an ad on
- 13 the ASTC website, and I think we placed ads on Monster.com.
- 14 Are you familiar with the name the Cowen Group? Q.
- 15 Α. Yes.
- 16 Can you tell me who they are? 0.
- 17 They are a headhunter. Α.
- 18 In 2008, when you were looking to hire a graphic
- 19 consultant, did you have any interaction with the Cowen Group?
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 Did you have communications with them? Q.
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 Do you recall what the form of the communication was? 0.
- 24 Α. Some phone calls, but predominantly e-mail.
- 25 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I would like to hand the

- 1 | witness Defendant's Exhibit C, please.
- 2 MR. RISK: No objection.
- THE COURT: No objection to C. C is received.
 - (Defendant's Exhibit C received in evidence)
 - Q. Do you recognize the first page of Exhibit C?
- 6 A. Yes.

4

5

- Q. And can you tell me what this is, please?
- 8 A. It's actually the cover letter from Cowen Group for Adina
- 9 Kadden's résumé.
- 10 | O. And who was this from?
- 11 A. Jared Coseglia.
- 12 | Q. Did you receive Exhibit C in connection with the position
- 13 | that you were looking to fill?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Can you tell us what, if anything, you did as a result of
- 16 receiving this document?
- 17 A. After reviewing it, I believe that I contacted Jared and
- 18 | said that based upon the experience and education that I would
- 19 be interested in interviewing this candidate.
- 20 Q. And what, in particular, do you remember was the
- 21 | educational part of it that you were interested in?
- 22 MR. RISK: Objection. Leading.
- 23 | THE COURT: I don't think that was leading. Maybe I
- 24 | didn't hear it.
- 25 | Q. I said, what, if anything, was the educational requirement

- that she found interesting? 1
- THE COURT: Maybe it's the word requirement. What was 2 3 the educational qualification that you found interesting?
- 4 THE WITNESS: She was a lawyer.
- 5 Q. Do you recall whether or not Ms. Kadden had any other experiences concerning graphic consulting? 6
- 7 A. Yeah. Actually, the two other things that intrigued me were that she worked at the U.S -- the Attorney General's 8
- 9 office and that in conjunction with that position she was
- 10 working with -- to develop the graphics presentations that were
- 11 used, and she also worked at a competitor of Visualex, Doar, as
- 12 a graphics consultant doing the same position that I was
- 13 looking to fill.
- 14 And were you familiar with Doar? Q.
- 15 Α. Yes.
- And how are you familiar with how the consultants worked at 16
- 17 Doar, since you didn't work at Doar?
- 18 A. Because Kim Nawyn was also from Doar and she was very
- 19 successful as a graphics consultant with Visualex.
- 20 Did Visualex ultimately decide to interview Ms. Kadden? 0.
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 Did you participate in the interview? Ο.
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 And who, if anyone, else did? Ο.
- 25 I know Kim interviewed her. I'm not exactly sure if Brian Α.

- did or not. It's kind of a long time ago. I can't remember. 1
- 2 Did you have a one-on-one interview with Ms. Kadden? Q.
- 3 Α. Yes.

- And at the interview did Ms. Kadden talk about her 0.
- 5 qualifications and her experience?
- Α. Yes. 6
- 7 And what did she tell you about her qualifications and
- 8 experience?
- 9 She told me that she was a lawyer and that she had worked
- 10 at the Attorney General's office and actually, that was a large
- 11 part of it, that she was actually working -- that was the first
- 12 time that she had had actually been exposed to that whole
- 13 graphics process and that she really liked that aspect of the
- 14 field. And then, of course, that she had been in litigation.
- 15 That kind of led her to taking the position at Doar, where she
- performed the same kinds of job duties that we were looking 16
- 17 for, which is basically consulting with clients to come up with
- case presentations and case strategies, and due to some 18
- 19 downsizing at Doar she had been let go and that was always
- 20 something she always enjoyed doing and she would like to get
- 21 back into the field.
- 22 Q. Did she discussed whether she worked as a consultant alone
- 23 or as part of a team?
- 24 As part of a team. Doar had multiple consultants as well,
- 25 just like Visualex does.

- 1 | Q. I know it's an obvious question, but were you interested in
- 2 Ms. Kadden as a result of the interview?
- 3 | A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. And did you ultimately offer her a position?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Did you discuss with her what the timing of the position
- 7 | was, meaning when you were looking to have someone start?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And when did you want someone to start?
- 10 A. I wanted someone to start immediately. We were really,
- 11 | really busy, and I wanted -- and we needed help desperately,
- 12 | and I wanted somebody who could hit the ground running as soon
- 13 as possible.
- MS. KLEIN: That box is music to my ears.
- 15 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 16 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, there should be an electronic
- 17 disk in there that has all the exhibits if you want it.
- 18 Q. She was ultimately hired?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. And the job that you hired her for was?
- 21 A. Graphics consultant.
- 22 | Q. At the time that you hired Ms. Kadden, how were graphic
- 23 consultants compensated?
- 24 A. At time they had a base salary, and then we paid incentive
- 25 overtime compensation.

2

- And who made the decision to pay consultants overtime compensation?
- I did. Α.
- 4 And what was the reason that you had made that decision? 0.
- 5 The reason was that I felt that I wanted to incentivize
- 6 people along the way as opposed to having to wait for a bonus
- 7 at some later time. I had been in the industry with three
- different companies for 15 years when I started Visualex, and I 8
- 9 just wanted to make sure that the compensation would
- 10 incentivize people to work as hard as you need to work when
- 11 you're a consultant.
- When you were working as a consultant in the entire time 12
- 13 that you worked in your profession, have you ever been given
- 14 the days off and then been required to report to work at night?
- 15 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm losing you.
- MS. KLEIN: I lost myself on that one. 16
- 17 During her years as a consultant I wanted to know
- 18 whether or not she worked the night shift?
- 19 THE COURT: Did she ever just work nights is what you
- 20 are asking?
- 21 MS. KLEIN: Yes.
- 22 Α. No.
- 23 Is the predominant part of the work of a consultant done
- 24 during evening hours?
- 25 Predominant, no. Α.

- 1 | Q. And when is the work generally done?
- 2 A. It's done while you're in the office. It starts at 9 and
- 3 | it goes -- it can go all night certainly, but we certainly
- 4 don't sit there from 9 to 6 and do nothing and wait to, all of
- 5 | a sudden, the witching hour comes at 6:00 and people start
- 6 asking you for stuff.
- 7 | Q. When you offered Ms. Kadden a job, did you offer her an
- 8 | employment contract?
- 9 | A. No.
- 10 | Q. Was the offer of employment memorialized anywhere?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And where was it memorialized?
- 13 A. In an offer letter.
- 14 | Q. Did a lawyer draft the offer letter?
- 15 A. I wish, but no.
- 16 | O. And where did that offer letter come from?
- 17 A. Actually, again, you know, having been in the industry and
- 18 several companies prior to starting Visualex, I took my offer
- 19 | letters and kind of pick and choose the basis of it and then
- 20 | added, obviously, some things that were just unique to
- 21 | Visualex.
- 22 \parallel Q. What were the things that were unique to Visualex?
- 23 | A. The incentive overtime compensation.
- 24 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I would like for the witness
- 25 to look at Defendant's Exhibit E.

C8DMKADT

MR. RISK: No objection.

- 2 | Q. Ms. Romano, are you familiar with this document?
- 3 A. Yes.

- 4 \mathbb{Q} . And what is it?
- 5 A. It's the invoice from the Cowen Group for the placement of
- 6 Adina contacted.
- 7 | Q. Did you pay a placement fee for her, a finding fee?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. How much did you pay?
- 10 A. \$18,750.
- 11 Q. Has Visualex ever paid that amount of money for a
- 12 | nonprofessional staff?
- 13 | A. No.
- 14 MS. KLEIN: It's already admitted since there is no
- 15 | objection.
- 16 THE COURT: No objection, E is admitted.
- 17 (Defendant's Exhibit E received in evidence)
- 18 Q. Do you recall the annualized base salary of Ms. Kadden's
- 19 offer?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 \parallel Q. And what was it?
- 22 A. \$75,000.
- 23 | Q. During Ms. Kadden's employment was her annualized base
- 24 | salary ever reduced to below 75,000?
- 25 A. No.

8

- 1 | Q. I ask you to do a little math. Do you know what Ms.
- 2 | Kadden's annualized base salary was on a weekly basis?
- 3 \parallel A. I think it was around \$1500.
 - THE COURT: I'm sorry?
- 5 THE WITNESS: Around \$1500 a week.
- Q. Where does the majority of the work of the graphic consultant take place?
 - A. In our office.
- 9 Q. And who is the primary beneficiary of the work of the 10 consultants?
- 11 A. Our clients.
- 12 Q. And during Ms. Kadden's employment did she perform the job
- of a graphic consultant as you described it today?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Does Visualex have and did they, during Ms. Kadden's
- 16 employment, a philosophy regarding what it is to be a
- 17 | consultant?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 \parallel Q. Can you explain to the Court what that philosophy is?
- 20 | A. We tried to separate ourselves from our competitors, and
- 21 | what we say to clients is we are not wrists. We don't blindly
- 22 | follow. We don't regurgitate what a trial team tells us to do.
- 23 We basically review materials and we recommend, based on our
- 24 experience, what we think the best way to present information
- 25 | to the trier of fact is, and we also really are very proactive

- in teaching ourselves and learning the really complex concepts 1 so that we can have intelligent conversations with experts and 2 3 that also we can review every graphic that's created to make 4 sure that, in our opinion, we think it is the most effective
 - Are you familiar with a case called CIEA?
 - Α. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

And what did that case deal with? Q.

way to present the information.

- It's actually a patent case that had to do with transgenic mice, which is basically -- obviously, when you want to do research, medical research on cancer drugs, you can't do it on humans, can't give humans cancer and then try to see what works and what doesn't. So what they basically do is breed mice and they get rid of the mouse immune system, and they actually put human cells in there which causes the mouse to have a human
- And who are the graphic consultants that worked on the CIEA case?

immune system, and then they can see what drugs are working.

- 19 Actually, all three of us worked on that case. Α.
- 20 When you say all three? 0.
- 21 It's myself, Adina Kadden, and Kim Nawyn. Α.
- 22 And the information that you just testified about regarding 23 how it worked and what it was about, was that in information
- 24 given to you by the trial team?
 - The background information was given to us. That case

actually was such a difficult concept that we did a lot of
Internet research. One of the things that we often take
advantage of are any kinds of sites that sometimes teach
children about these kinds of things because when you are
trying to explain these complex concepts to jurors, sometimes
looking like on how the body works, those kinds of things, help
you to distill it down so it's easier to understand.

- Q. What is your philosophy about not being wrists? What does that mean when you say not to be a wrist?
- A. We just don't blindly follow. A lot of times attorney will say I need and we always stop them and say, no, tell us what you want the takeaway to be, and we will tell you what you need. Don't tell us what you want. We will tell you what you need in order to convey that point. There are basically, we are not just regurgitating if they say we want a pie chart and we say okay here is a pie chart, that's not what we do at all. We bring value.
- Q. Why don't you just do what they need or ask you for?
- A. Then they wouldn't really need us. They are hiring us because we are experts in this field, and that's our job, to recommend to them the best way to portray the information, and also a lot of times when we get involved the attorneys have been working on the cases for years and years and years. They get so close to the information, we will come to them and say, we don't understand that. And if we don't understand that,

- obviously, it's something that needs to be explained to the jury or to a judge, so we help them also identify areas where
 - Q. Are you familiar with a case called Wells Fargo?

they should be targeting for the use of graphics.

A. Yes.

3

4

5

7

8

- 6 | Q. And how are you familiar with that case?
 - A. It was another case that Visualex was retained on.
 - Q. And who were the graphic consultants that worked at
- 9 | Visualex on Wells Fargo?
- 10 A. Again, it was myself, Kim, and Adina, all three of us.
- 11 Q. And did the three consultants in either this case or the
- 12 one you just talked about have different roles?
- 13 A. No. We are all responsible for coming up with the best way
 14 to present the evidence.
- Q. And can you explain to us how it works when there is more than one consultant assigned to a case?
- 17 A. Yeah. One of the other things that we do that sets us
- apart is that we always want to have a person in the office who
- 19 is smart about the business. So all of us, at least two
- 20 consultants and oftentimes all three consultants, will read all
- 21 | the case materials because if any one of us is out, you don't
- 22 | want the client to have to call and say, this is what the case
- 23 is about. You want to have a smart person there so they can
- 24 respond to any requests.
 - And, also, since it's such a iterative process and

- 1 | you're constantly communicating back and forth, you have to
- 2 have the base knowledge of the facts of the case and an
- 3 understanding of what needs to be communicated so that you can
- 4 | evaluate. As each exhibit comes through and is created you can
- 5 | evaluate, does it do what it's supposed to do.
- 6 Q. Does that evaluation process only take place when the
- 7 | exhibit or the demonstrative is first created?
- 8 | A. No.
- 9 Q. Can you explain to us that?
- 10 A. That evaluation is constantly taking place. Again, that's
- 11 | what we are doing as consultants, is taking place internally,
- 12 | before a layout ever goes out to a trial team, and then it's
- 13 | taking place when the trial team then communicates changes or
- 14 concerns about what they have reviewed. And so what you are
- 15 doing as a consultant is constantly, you are always passing
- 16 everything through that filter of, does this do what it's
- 17 | supposed to do. And if the answer is yes, the second question
- 18 needs to be, does it do it in the best way possible? And if
- 19 | the answer is no, then you need to come up with a different
- 20 approach.
- 21 Q. And is it possible that, for example, simply a change of a
- 22 color could change the takeaway?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Can you explain that to us?
- 25 A. Because humans process different colors in different ways.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Certain colors evoke visceral reactions. So, for example, red 1

usually means dangerous because of stop signs and so we usually use red for our adversaries, and blues and greens are very

pleasing colors, so we use them for traditionally our clients. 4

Also, there are instances where a client is a company that has a very well recognized logo that has a color associated with it. For example, we do a lot of work for AstraZeneca, and they are the purple pill. Of course, the AstraZeneca exhibits were purple.

- And when constantly evaluating through the different iterations of the document, if a client says, oh, I'd like all the text centered, would that make a difference to you as a consultant?
- 14 Α. Yes.
 - Q. Can you explain why?
 - Because, again, as a consultant, you understand how humans process information. And just like every novel you ever pick up has left justified text, we read from left to right. when you center text it makes it very difficult to find the next line. Especially when you're ten feet away in a jury box or ten feet away from a screen, that's exacerbated. We always tell people, don't center your text because it's much easier to read if it's left justified.
 - Q. Would it be the job of the consultant to express that opinion if one of your clients told you to do something that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was center?

MR. RISK: Objection, leading.

THE COURT: Can you rephrase it?

MS. KLEIN: Yes.

- Q. If a customer of Visualex asked you to center text, is it appropriate for the consultant to give their opinion as to the effectiveness of that?
- A. Yes. Obviously, again, they are hiring us as experts in visual presentations. So whenever a client -- that's the interaction. That's what we do. Whenever anyone asks us to do something that we don't believe is going to increase the effectiveness of an exhibit and in fact may decrease the effectiveness of an exhibit, we absolutely give our opinion and recommend what we think needs to be done.

MR. RISK: Move to strike everything after the answer yes.

THE COURT: I don't even recall what it was. I don't have real time up here. I have to hear it all back, unless you agree.

> I don't agree. MS. KLEIN:

THE COURT: Let me hear the whole answer, please.

(Record read)

THE COURT: I'll allow it.

Turning your attention back to the Wells Fargo case, again, just to remind me, who were the consultants assigned to that

- 1 case.
- It was the three of us that were there at the time Visualex 2
- 3 was retained: Myself, Adina, and Kim.
- 4 When you say Adina, you're referring to the plaintiff in
- 5 this case?
- A. Yes. 6
- 7 Q. As you sit here today do you recall whether the Visualex
- consultants, were they given case information in connection 8
- 9 with that case?
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 And is it necessary for the consultants to review legal
- 12 documents to do their job?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 Q. Why?
- 15 Α. Because you review anything that is going to get you up to
- speed on the strategy. Usually, we ask for summary judgment 16
- 17 motions, the complaint, the answer, any expert reports,
- 18 anything that we think is going to get us up to speed so we
- 19 don't have to drag the trial team down and have them explain to
- 20 us what's going on.
- 21 Q. Why don't you not just rely on the information that's given
- 22 to you by the team, the trial team?
- 23 A. Because they are not looking at that information in the
- 24 same way we are. We are looking at that information to
- 25 determine, A, what's difficult to understand and what should be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

supported by a graphic presentation and, B, once we identify that to say, okay, what is the form the information is being conveyed in these legal briefings and expert reports, and is that the best way to present it visually, or is there a better way, and how does that fit in the overall visual strategy that we are developing.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I'd like to hand to the witness Defendant's Exhibit G1. And this is one of those, your Honor, that's huge, huge, and I have made summaries for everyone, if that makes it easier.

THE COURT: I would rather take the summary.

MS. KLEIN: Is that one of the smaller ones? thought it was one of the bigger ones.

THE COURT: Summary or is this the exhibit? Is this the summary?

> This is the full exhibit of this one. MS. KLEIN:

THE COURT: Are you giving me the summary?

MS. KLEIN: We broke it down. We broke it down to G1, G2, G3. It's already sectioned off from the other part. are not going through every page on this.

THE COURT: You don't have anything smaller to give me?

> MS. KLEIN: No. That's it.

Your Honor, it's my understanding that G1 MR. RISK: is not going to be offered into evidence and it's some sort of

1 demonstrative.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

THE COURT: I don't think so. I think it's a portion of what, G?

MS. KLEIN: G1 is going to be offered. This was one that was created by Ms. Kadden and --

THE COURT: It's a portion of a fuller exhibit?

MS. KLEIN: Yes.

THE COURT: The fuller exhibit is marked G.

MS. KLEIN: Correct.

MR. RISK: G1 is indicated DEM 0001.

MS. KLEIN: Defendant's Exhibit G1. That is an identification to make it easier for us to get through the This wasn't part of the document production. You pages. didn't ask for it. I put numbers on it to make it easier for the Court to follow the testimony.

MR. RISK: I'm sorry, your Honor. I was told I was going to get some demonstratives. This is the only one that indicated G1.

THE COURT: But it's not.

- Q. Ms. Romano, are you familiar with what's been marked as Defendant's G1?
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 I would like to turn your attention to the pages that are 24 numbered DEM 00024 through 25.
- 25 Α. Okay.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Can you tell me what this says?
- These are pages from an expert report from an expert that 2 Α. 3 was testifying in the Wells Fargo case.
 - Can you explain to us what the Wells Fargo case was about? Q.
 - Yeah. It had to do with a securities lending program for which Wells Fargo was the trustee, and there were four investors in the trust that lost some money because some of the underlying investments defaulted. And they were suing Wells Fargo basically saying that Wells Fargo should have known that these were going to default. But it was during the time when
- 12 nobody could have foreseen the economic crisis and that it was

the whole economy tanked. And so it was our position that

- 13 not Wells Fargo's fault.
- 14 Q. And during Ms. Kadden's employment while she was working as
- 15 a consultant, was she required to review pages DEM 000024 and
- 25? 16
- 17 All three of us read all -- were supposed to read all of the case documentation for this case. 18
- 19 And the purpose of reviewing these particular pages was 20 what?
- 21 A. Well, these were pages that jumped out at us, obviously, 22 since the case had to do with securities lending program. 23 first thing we had to teach the jury was, what does that mean 24 and how does it work so that they could evaluate whether it 25 worked the way it was supposed to in determining who had the

- responsibility for the money that was lost by the plaintiffs. 1
- 2 And did the consultants imagine a way to depict this Ο. 3 information that's on 24 and 25?
 - Α. Yes.

4

5

8

14

15

18

19

20

21

- Can you explain to the Court what it is that you did?
- If you look at DEM 13, we basically developed a flow 6 Α. 7 chart, and oftentimes because the way humans learn is through

repetition and reinforcement, we developed a base flow chart

9 that had all of the steps -- all of the parties involved in the

process. And then we pull off some explanatory texts for each 10

11 of the steps and then you light up things. Again, it's a way

12 of being able to spoonfeed the jury, help the expert explain a

13 complex concept that they probably weren't familiar with.

So in the first one you can see that the lenders sell their securities to or give their securities to Wells Fargo.

And then if you go to the next one you can just see how -- if 16

17 you go to the next step is that the borrower borrows the

security and so on. If you just scroll through these, you can

see we basically came up with a flow chart that enabled the

expert to explain every step in the securities lending process.

- If you could just take a look back at DEM 000014. Q.
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 Can you look at this and tell us what was the intended
- 24 takeaway for your client?
- 25 Well, we wanted to show what was actually happening.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

so obviously you can see that -- first thing that we do is craft a title that basically tells what the exhibit is about. So this is how the securities lending program works. And then in this particular step we are explaining what the borrower does. So the borrower borrows the security and then he has to post cash collateral at 102 percent in the event there is -any value is lost. So the 102 percent collateral covers that. That's basically what I was trying to explain.

- And do your clients tell you what the title should be?
- 10 Α. No.
 - 0. Who crafts that?
 - The consultant crafts it. The title is probably the most important thing on any graphic. And what we always tell clients is that, you know, we will craft a title that gives the takeaway. And sometimes you really, really push the envelope on the title because the theory behind it is that if the jury doesn't even do anything other than read the title, they understand why you are showing them the graphic and what the takeaway is. We also pick the colors, so, obviously, this is an exhibit that's going to be used in furtherance of our position in the case, which is why it's blue. Green for money so that people understand what's happening. We developed Again, icons are the little pictures of things. So the securities, it looks like a little stock certificate. All of these things just make the concepts less intimidating to a jury

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

so that they are more comfortable with it.

I am not going to give a psychology lesson, but, basically, what you want to avoid is something called cognitive dissidence, which is that juries shut down if they don't know what to do with information. They either distort it, misrepresent it, or minimize its importance. You don't want them to do that for any of the things that you think are important to advancing your case. We try to make it as easy as possible for them to understand things.

- I would like you to look in also G1 DEM 000019 through DEM Can you explain to us what this is?
- This was also from an expert report. And one of the things that we felt was important is to make the point that Wells Fargo, in addition to being the trustee, also invested in the trust. And so it was to go to motivation. What would our motivation be to invest in things that we thought were going to lose money if we had the most to lose and we were actually invested in the trust as well. So this was an appendix to the expert report. And, obviously, you can see, if you scroll through this, there is just a lot of names with numbers. And if you were to show it to a jury this way, you would be forcing them to do a lot of analysis and evaluation to figure out. Number one, what does it mean and how does it fit with the overall scheme of your case? And so what we do as consultants is recommend the best way to take this information and put it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- in a visual form so it's easier to understand.
- Who were the consultants that worked on figuring out a 0. visual strategy and takeaway for these particular three pages?

MR. RISK: Objection, leading.

THE COURT: Who were the consultants? What's the leading part?

I think the question is eliciting the MR. RISK: answer that Ms. Kadden did the strategic work.

THE COURT: She is saying identify the experts who worked on it. That's not leading.

Who worked on this one?

THE WITNESS: We all worked on it. All three of us: Adina, myself, and Kim. As I said, there is always at least two and in this particular one there were three of us.

Q. Please turn your attention to DEM 000044 through DEM 000056.

Can you tell me what this is that we are looking at? A. Again, this is information that was provided to us by an expert, and this was a listing. And if you scroll through it it's just pages and pages and pages of issuers. Basically, in the case these are 416 securities that the plaintiffs alleged were unsuitable and should not have been invested in.

MS. KLEIN: I apologize. I skipped something. Can I have us move back.

The last expert report that you were testifying about,

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pages 19 through 21, did you turn that into a visual?

- Yes, we did. Α.
- And what visual is that in this packet? 0.
- Α. It's DEM 22.
- And can you please turn to that page. And can you explain to us what it is that is trying to be conveyed in DEM 22?
- 6

the largest participant in the trust and, therefore, what would their motivation be to invest in unsuitable investments. of those names that you would have forced a jury to go through and try to find them, we basically applauded it in a bar chart and we color Wells Fargo blue because it's our client and you can clearly see that it makes the point much more effectively

In DEM 22, as I said, the takeaway was that Wells Fargo was

that they were the largest participant and therefore had the most to lose.

And this is kind of how the process works. develop this and send it to the client for a review, they said, this is great, it absolutely works, but what it doesn't do is show what Wells Fargo percentage is compared to the plaintiff's in the case. And I said, okay, we can do something that builds upon this.

And if you go to DEM 23, instead of doing a bar chart for that one, we actually decided that pie charts were the better way to convey that information because we -- it wasn't necessary to see what everyone else was doing. Now we were

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Romano - direct

just focused on the four plaintiffs and Wells Fargo. By pulling that piece out of the pie, you separate that and focus the attention and then we color-code each of the plaintiffs, so it was very easy to find what any one of them's percentage was in comparison to Wells Fargo.

Once they received that pie chart, they said, wow, this is great, but there are reasons, strategic reasons we want to show certain points in time and how that percentage that Wells Fargo still remained the largest participant over a relevant time period. And so we said, okay, we can do four pie charts on one so you can see that trend easily.

- Q. And did the clients at Visualex tell you when this case started that they wanted a demonstrative exhibit that had four pies on it?
- 15 | A. No.
- 16 Q. Did they ultimately use those?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. Do you know what the outcome of the case was?
- 19 A. Actually, we technically lost, but it wasn't a large award,
 20 so it was considered a win by the client.
- Q. Now, if you could go back to the 44 through 56. If you can walk us through and explain to us what the consultants did in connection with this information.
- A. Again, what I mentioned earlier, that this is a list of the
 400 somewhat unsuitable investments as alleged by the

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

plaintiffs. And what we needed to show is that the strategy that Wells Fargo employed in dealing with the economic downturn was called a hold to maturity strategy. And so basically we had to explain that if we had sold these unsuitables as soon as the market started tanking we would have definitely incurred really, really large losses. So we felt that the best course of action was to hold them and hopefully the economy would come

- back and that some of them would either be sold or mature at 8 9 par.
 - Q. Ms. Romano, when you say what we needed to show, I think you said that through a couple of the exhibits we have gone through, who is the we you are referring to?
 - The we -- the we is the consultants at Visualex and the trial team. We consider ourselves part of the trial team. so we really don't make much of a distinction between that when we are dealing with the visual presentation. Our clients, we consider them -- we are an extension of our clients.
 - Please continue explaining the process.
 - If you scroll through this, you can see that is mind numbing and nobody would be able to tell what this is actually trying to convey. And so we needed to figure out a way to present this information in a fairly simple matter.

Actually, if you look at the headings up at the top, you can see that there is a lot of information here. receive something like this, obviously, there is a lot of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

information here. Since you're constrained by the size of a screen -- we used to do boards. We don't do boards anymore. Even so, you have a finite area to put something on. would be a difficult task to convey all of this information. And so what you do as the consultant is say, well, explain to me what is the most important takeaway that you want to get from this and the most important takeaway is that the hold maturity strategy was right, that maturity date, the face amount, all of this stuff is irrelevant to make that point.

If you look at the status column, that's really the key information, whether it's matured, whether it's sold, whether it actually in fact defaulted. That's the column we focused on and decided to come up with a visual representation of these 400 some odd securities focused on what was occurring in that column.

- Can you tell us how the consultants recommended to their clients to visually depict this information?
- If you look at DEM 57, there were actually three A. Yes. trusts at issue here. And so the first thing that we did is separate it into three separate exhibits, one for each trust, so that we had the room to be able to make the representation of each issuer is represented by a box. We were able to get bigger sizes on it by not putting all 400 on one. So we broke it down by trust. You can see, these are the 170. Those were the big lists. There was 170 of those in the business trust.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Romano - direct

And then if you bring up DEM 58, if you went down that column, you would see that only three out of the 170 defaulted, so it was a very small percentage.

And then if you look -- that was actually the simpler of the three. If you look at DEM 60, this was the collateral investment trust. That status column had several other types of identifiers. So 188 matured at par. That's actually not so bad, 188 out of 216. 13 were sold, one was transferred or matured, 12 were extended, and only one defaulted. Obviously, the hold to maturity strategy was the correct strategy to protect the investors in their investment.

- And was this demonstrative exhibit that we are looking at ultimately used in the courtroom?
- 14 Yes. Α.
 - Ο. Is it fair to say that that was the ultimate product that was produced?
 - That was displayed in the courtroom. The Wells Fargo case had over 400 exhibits when all was said and done. It was a pretty complicated case and it lasted for three weeks. A lot of expert witness testimony, really dense financial information.
 - MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I'd like to move to have G1 admitted.
 - MR. RISK: Objection, your Honor. All but four or five pages were not listed in the pretrial order.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Double negative. I don't understand what you said.

MR. RISK: This exhibit is not in the joint pretrial order, except for five pages are.

THE COURT: You mean G1?

That's right. MR. RISK:

THE COURT: I thought she said it's all there, but this is breaking out portions of G, which was a real fat exhibit.

MS. KLEIN: This was on the revised exhibit list that we submitted to the Court. You were correct, it wasn't on the original one that was part of the first pretrial order. And then we submitted a revised one, as you also, counsel, reserved your right to, as we got closer, put specific numbers in. Clearly you have known about this for weeks.

MR. RISK: I first saw these documents in the evening of August 9. Four or five of them are on the original pretrial order.

THE COURT: Anyway, what are we going to do? I have seen them already. It's a nonjury trial. They are just graphics. I get the point of what graphics are. I have tried a lot of cases.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I do apologize. I know your Honor has, but this is unfortunately the substance of the case.

> THE COURT: I am going to overrule the objection. Ι

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- 1 know what graphics are.
 - Q. I would like you to take a look at what we have marked as
 - MS. KLEIN: May I approach?
 - MR. RISK: Your Honor, for the record, I am going to make the same objection that these were not in the pretrial order.
 - THE COURT: Overruled.
 - Q. Ms. Romano, have you ever seen G3 before?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Can you tell us what this is, generally?
- 12 A. This is an expert report from a different case. We called
- 13 | it the SCOR arbitration. It was basically an arbitration that
- 14 we did on behalf of Allianz that was related to the World Trade
- 15 Center insurance coverage litigation that we did actually down
- 16 | the hall in Judge Mukasey's courtroom. But this had to do
- 17 | with, obviously, there was a lot more money that the insurance
- 18 company had to pay out than that he thought because of the
- 19 | global settlement. And this was Allianz trying to recover
- 20 | their payout from their reinsurance company, which was SCOR.
- 21 Q. Who were the consultants at Visualex who worked on the SCOR
- 22 | arbitration?
- 23 A. Again, it was the three of us that were there at the time
- 24 | Visualex was retained: Myself, Adina, and Kim Nawyn.
- 25 | Q. Were the job responsibilities in connection with the

- graphic consulting divvied up between the three of you? 1
- We all were all responsible to do the same thing. I don't 2 Α. 3 know what you mean by divvy up.
- 4 Did each of you have specific tasks? 0.
- 5 Our specific tasks were to consult on the case, to 6 generate --
- 7 Were the three of you consulting on different areas?
- 8 Α. No.
- 9 Can you please take a look at DEM 000080 through 82, which 0. 10 is part of G3, and explain to the Court what this is?
- 11 This is, again, from the expert report. One of the things
- 12 that was important to show is what SCOR's motivation was to go
- 13 along with the settlement during the negotiations and not say
- 14 anything about thinking that Allianz was doing anything wrong
- 15 by agreeing to the settlement. And so the explanation that the
- expert was giving was that SCOR had experienced an economic 16
- 17 downturn, and the way you can evaluate the financial strength
- 18 of the company is by looking at their ratings given by the
- 19 ratings agencies. This is an appendix to the expert report and
- 20 this is how he presented the information. And once we received
- 21 that, we felt that that was not the most effective way to make
- 22 that point.

25

- 23 So what advice did Visualex give its client in order to
- 24 advance its client's case?
 - We recommended that the tabular type of presentation of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- information should be converted to a line chart so you could actually follow and see the trend. And then you could also focus on the particular relevant time in the context of what
- Q. And Were the consultants able to figure out a visual strategy that would get your client's point across?
- Α. Yes.

happened before.

- And is that contained within G3?
- If you look at DEM 83. So the first thing to note Yes. here is that the graphic is red, got a red title band. As I mentioned earlier, red has a visceral response of stop, bad, whatever. The consultant would say, we want this to be a red exhibit.

The second thing you will notice is the takeaway, which is SCOR's weak capital levels and deteriorating performance were damaging to their credit profile. You see you have the whole chart, but part of it is way back because what we want to be able to focus on is the time prior to the time of the relevant month, because we want to show all of the ratings agencies' downgrading score. That tabular thing that we showed earlier, basically, what we did, we gave a circle and a number to each of the four rating agencies and they are the big ones, S&P, A.M. Best, Moody's, and Fitch.

Every time the rating changed, we put the circle in there so I could follow the trend. Then we added the dotted

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

line because once you fall below a A minus credit rating, people in the market don't want to go near you. That was kind of the demarcation that we wanted to be able to explain to the arbitration panel, that once they fell below this, obviously, you can see that ratings agencies were downgrading them.

- Why is this important to your client's case?
- Because other than -- if you were to try to explain this concept using that tabular information, I don't know about you, but I didn't get that takeaway from that appendix, from the expert report, but this really is an instantaneous, you can definitely see what's happening, you can see the trend. you are also able to follow individual ones of the ratings agencies, if necessary. And so it really armed the expert with a wonderful vehicle of being able to explain this point.

THE COURT: How many more of these demonstratives do you want to show in this trial? Because I get the point. not going to sit through 50 more demonstratives at all. How many more do you think --

MS. KLEIN: Right now this is the last one I have for this and then there was specific ones, which we don't have to go through if counsel is going to admit. I have tons of them that have Ms. Kadden's handwriting all over them. Unless she is going to admit, which I would assume and hope that she would, that that was her consulting on them, it's her initials all over them. This is what the case is about, whether or not

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

she was acting as a consultant. 1 2

THE COURT: I don't know that that's what the case is about.

> MS. KLEIN: That's what I understand the case to be.

THE COURT: Not me.

MS. KLEIN: Is whether or not the job duties and responsibilities that she was doing were exempt.

THE COURT: That's right. In other words, there may be no disagreement that she was working on these graphics and her initials show she was working on these graphics. doesn't decide the case. Then there is the question of law for me to decide whether the person who does this work, creating and changing and revising these graphics, is exempt. That's for me.

> MS. KLEIN: Yes.

THE COURT: I don't know that there is any factual disagreement. Indeed, she may agree she worked on these exhibits.

MS. KLEIN: Again, I think the question goes to, she didn't work on them in the sense -- she wasn't responsible for actually producing them.

THE COURT: Not the artwork, I know.

MS. KLEIN: But in regards to understanding the underlying legal issues, reading them, reviewing them, making an analysis and determination.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I understand that. Something Ms. Romano is perfectly capable of doing, too, and she is not a lawyer.

MS. KLEIN: Yes.

THE COURT: I get it.

MS. KLEIN: Again, it goes right towards all of the different exemptions.

THE COURT: I know it does. I'm losing what we are debating here.

Maybe you can help, Mr. Risk. Your client doesn't disagree. She worked on these exhibits with the graphic artists.

MR. RISK: Your Honor, the question is what she did on these exhibits.

THE COURT: When you get her on the stand, you will ask her.

MS. KLEIN: When we talk about what she did on that, then we are going to have to go through --

THE COURT: I'm telling you both right now, there is a limited number I will go through. We have probably gone through five or six. I'm not going to go through a hundred, I am not going to go through 50.

MS. KLEIN: Two different cases.

THE COURT: Five or six or seven exhibits from other trials. That's about enough. You want to go to ten, fine, but that's it. Three more of these, maybe? I don't need them,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

really. I understand trial exhibits. I've been doing this for years and seeing all these exhibits. Now it's nice to know how they got made, but I assume they got made that way all along.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, what is important, not to disagree at all, is showing what is the value, if any, what is the part that the consultant is doing.

> I understand. It's a creative process. THE COURT:

MS. KLEIN: It is using independent thought, knowledge --

THE COURT: It's all of that. There is a process of creating it. First, there was this ugly list of tightly packed data that somebody wants to read and suddenly there is one chart. It morphed from a list to a chart. It took a few people to do that. It took the graphic people and the consultant people and the lawyer people back at the law firm. And those three groups together, the lawyer people, the consultant people and the graphic people, together came up with this.

MS. KLEIN: It does. What is important is whether or not what they came up with something is a matter of significance. It matters directly towards the exemption. Again, I am not going to go through tons more.

THE COURT: That's really a legal argument. me endless exhibits doesn't change that. I understand these are exhibits and you use it at trial. That's all you need to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Romano - direct

say about matters of importance. If that's what the law defines as matters of significance. In other words, one exhibit to the other doesn't make that difference. I get trial exhibits. You see my point?

MS. KLEIN: I do. I apologize for having to go through this. I also just to make sure that I am showing -- I don't want to assume --

THE COURT: You showed seven or eight. I am saying stop at ten. That's enough.

MS. KLEIN: May I proceed, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

Q. Please look at DEM 000084, Ms. Romano. That's part of G3?

That's part of what? THE COURT:

G3. You have that. MS. KLEIN:

THE COURT: Great.

- Just looking at this, can you tell me what it is that the consultant was recommending to the client?
 - A. Well, the first thing is so, again, because it's repetition and reinforcement, we are building on the same chart. changed the title because the takeaway from that chart is going to be different. It now says -- it's now communicating the takeaway that SCOR didn't achieve or return to an A rating across the board until November 20, 2006. The reason that's important and we know it from reading the expert reports is that they didn't want to do anything at that time that would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cause those ratings would be downgraded again. And so the yellow, if you go to the next one, DEM 85, that's the relevant time period that are the settlement negotiations. So you can see why they weren't going to increase their reserves, because they knew that doing that would endanger their economic recovery or at least the perception of their economic recovery in the market. If the client, the lawyers called and said, I want you to change the title to green, what was the consultant at Visualex supposed to do? A. We would say, first of all, it's color coded and anything with SCOR we have color coded red, and the reason we do that is because it is going to evoke something bad happened. the feeling we want the jury to have when they look at this, or in this case the arbitration panel. And we don't have green in the case and all of a sudden to throw up an exhibit that has a

green title would not fit in with the overall visual strategy.

Q. Would it have made a difference if the client told you that they wanted the various lines to be broken up in dots?

I don't think it would have shown the trend and, again, that's what we are saying as the experts here. If you are trying to show a trend, which is what my understanding is, what the takeaway is, that would not be the best way. response to that conversation, the attorney may say, well,

that's what I told -- that's what we wanted to do originally,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Romano - direct

but now we found this other information and we don't think we want to show the trend. It's a constant iteration process, whereas the consultant you are saying, tell me your concerns about this, tell me why you don't think it does what it's supposed to do, and then they give you more information and then you say, well, in light of that, we are going to change it this way or, in light of that, we still recommend that this is the best presentation.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I move to have G3 admitted.

THE COURT: Is there an objection?

MR. RISK: I think I made the objection and your Honor admitted.

THE COURT: I think so, too. G3 was received.

(Defendant's Exhibit G3 received in evidence)

- 15 Q. Ms. Romano, is the job of the graphic consultant during Ms.
- Kadden's employment the same as a production coordinator? 16
- 17 Α. No.
- 18 Can you explain to us what is the different
- 19 responsibilities?
- 20 A. Production coordinator is just that. They are just
- 21 coordinating the production. So they are basically just
- 22 trafficking the exhibits around the studio because there is a
- 23 fairly elaborate process that's followed to create every
- 24 And the production coordinator is just tracking that exhibit.
- 25 layout around the office. And then the production coordinator

- Romano direct
- 1 | is also the one -- the consultant when you put anything into
- 2 | this the studio basically says, okay, these exhibits have to be
- 3 out by this time for these people, and the production
- 4 coordinator is tracking to make sure that it's getting done and
- 5 then assembling the presentation to actually then get to the
- 6 client for their review.
- 7 Q. When the consultants are working on a case, do they manage
- 8 | the production coordinator?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. Do they have the authority to tell the production manager
- 11 | when to report to work?
- 12 A. Yes. There are times when you have to come in earlier or
- 13 stay late, yes.
- 14 | Q. And do they tell them when to leave?
- 15 | A. They tell them, yes, when they are able to leave if there
- 16 are deadlines that need to be met.
- 17 | Q. Not from a legal perspective, but from Visualex's
- 18 perspective, do you group the different job titles you talked
- 19 | about into different categories?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. What are those categories?
- 22 | A. We have a professional staff, which are basically the
- 23 people that are determining what needs to be done and when it
- 24 needs to be done, and that's the consultants and also to some
- 25 degree the art directors. So there is a hierarchy that

- consultants basically explain to the art director what needs to
- 2 be done. And then the art director then hands out various
- 3 exhibits and explains to the designers from an aesthetic
- 4 standpoint that needs to be done and also communicates to the
- 5 designers as well what the takeaway that he's been told has to
- 6 be achieved, as was briefed by the consultant.
- 7 | Q. Is the production coordinator considered to be part of the
- 8 professional staff?
- 9 | A. No.
- 10 | Q. Does the production coordinator receive overtime?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. What is the specific job of the graphic designers?
- 13 A. The graphic designers actually just create the layout in
- 14 one of the software programs. The Adobe Suite software is what
- 15 | we use.
- 16 | Q. So are they responsible for the actual physical creation?
- 17 A. They are executing -- yes, they are executing on two
- 18 | levels. They are executing what they have been told the best
- 19 | way to achieve the takeaway is, and they are executing
- 20 | specifically what the art director has put in place as far as
- 21 | what type of layout to use, whether the title band should be
- 22 | across the top or if it should be on the side, those kinds of
- 23 | things.
- 24 | Q. Are the graphic designers considered part of the
- 25 professional staff?

- 1 A. No.
- Q. Why not?
- 3 A. Because they just do what they are told to do. They don't
- 4 get to tell anybody what to do.
- 5 | Q. And do you have a bookkeeper?
- 6 | A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. And is she considered part of the professional staff?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. And why not?
- 10 A. Again, she is just basically taking information that people
- 11 enter and just running various reports and using it to generate
- 12 | payroll or taxes or whatever. She doesn't get to -- the
- 13 | information she is working is the information. She doesn't get
- 14 | to change it, judge it, do whatever. She just presses a button
- 15 | to get the software to print out the reports necessary to run a
- 16 | business.
- 17 | Q. Are the graphic consultants considered part of the
- 18 professional staff?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. And have they always been part of the professional staff?
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And can you explain why?
- 23 | A. Because they are the ones who are directing what needs to
- 24 be done on a daily basis and are assembling the team within
- 25 | Visualex to actually meet the deadlines and deliver what our

- 1 | clients are hiring us to deliver.
- Q. Are the same deliverables that you talked about ever recycled and used again in another case?
- 4 A. Not without changes. Sometimes the same concepts are used
- 5 | from one case to the next, but you can never use a graphic as
- 6 is with no changes. Every case is different. So you always
- 7 have to alter for fact patterns.
- 8 Q. Did Ms. Kadden during her employment work on any cases
- 9 other than Wells Fargo and SCOR?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And can you tell me on how many cases did she work as a
- 12 | consultant?
- 13 A. I couldn't -- a lot. A lot. Any case that was in the --
- 14 | there is no -- we are a pretty small office. Everybody is
- 15 | working on everything. Everybody knows what's going on.
- 16 | That's why we have 4:00 production meetings every night, so
- 17 | everybody knows what's going on. She worked on every case.
- 18 Q. Do the graphic consultants do any marketing?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. And is marketing part of their job?
- 21 A. It's part of the job. Obviously, you want to always have
- 22 | more potential clients out there, but it's certainly not a
- 23 primary responsibility. Any marketing activities are only done
- 24 when there is no case work.
- 25 | Q. Are you familiar with the phrase primary contact?

Α. Yes.

1

- And what does that mean in Visualex's business? 2 Q.
- 3 Basically, it's just an easy way for attorneys to know who
- to call, who to ask for when they call the office if they need 4
- to get something done. 5
- 6 And does Visualex use the nomenclature of lead consultant? 0.
- 7 Sometimes, yeah. Α.
- Explain to me the different job between the lead consultant 8
- 9 and the nonlead.
- 10 I mean, honestly, there is no difference in the job.
- 11 just the mouthpiece. Someone needs to communicate to the
- 12 client what we have decided is the best way to present
- 13 something or communicate whether we don't agree with what they
- 14 are asking us to do or if they have suggestions of what needs
- 15 to be done. It's basically the person who is the face. It's
- kind of like a partner on a case. You don't call a 200-person 16
- 17 law firm and just say, hi, I'm Joe Shmoe and just expect
- everybody -- you have a person to ask for. 18
- 19 Q. And can you explain to us the process during Ms. Kadden's
- 20 employment of how it was if there was a particular case that
- 21 the consultants would work together in coming up with the
- 22 visual strategy, internally, how it worked?
- 23 A. When the background information came in, everybody -- at
- 24 least two, but in most cases all three of us would review the
- 25 information. I made a business decision in many cases not to

Romano - direct

- bill for all three people. I never billed for all three people reading it. First of all, the clients would push back on that. But it's a business decision that I wanted to be able to represent that when you hire Visualex you hire a company where everybody is smart on your case. And when documentation would come in, we have a folder that's called public on the server and it would go into that folder under the case number so that all of the consultants had access to that information to be able to read it. And also if they wanted to go back and look at something or need to pull information from that that it was
- Q. During this time did Ms. Kadden work on cases commonly referred to as CSX?
- 14 A. Yes.
- \parallel O. What is CSX?
- 16 A. CSX is the railroad.

accessible to all of us.

- Q. Can you explain what Ms. Kadden did in connection with CSX as a consultant?
 - A. CSX is a large client of Visualex and over the years they have waves of different types of litigation. So, basically, what happens is that, you know, plaintiff lawyers say, hey, we work for the railroad and do you have hearing loss, then you have all these hearing loss claims. You try a couple of them, you get a few defense verdicts and they say, we are not recovering under that. Do you have carpal tunnel syndrome when

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Romano - direct

you are fixing the locomotives, you can get carpal tunnel and you have that wave. There are these waves of litigation that we do for CSX.

The current waves are solvent litigation, that you're exposed to solvents, allegedly called toxic brain encephalopathy from cleaning the locomotives and also ballast cases. Walking on ballasts gives osteoarthritis.

Whenever we get these cases, we have to read the depositions of the medical doctors and the workers to try to come up with graphics that are going to advance the position of the railroad, which is that we were not responsible.

- Q. And did Ms. Kadden work on these CSX cases?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. Did she work on the advice strategy of them?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- Q. And did she create demonstrative exhibits that were ultimately delivered to the clients?
- 18 A. Yes.
- Q. Were there any cases that you recall, as you sit here today, whether or not Ms. Kadden was identified as the primary
- 21 || contact?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | O. And what cases were those?
- A. There were a couple of them. Sobieski case, the Derea
- 25 case, the Mirror World case at a certain juncture.

4

5

6

7

8

9

Romano - direct

THE COURT: Which one? 1

THE WITNESS: Mirror World. 2

THE COURT: Two words?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Mirror World. It was a patent case against Apple.

- Can you tell us about some of the patent work that the consultants work on?
- Tell you --Α.
- For example --Ο.
- 10 Α. Yes.
- What was Visualex retained for in connection with Mirror 11 12 World?
- 13 A. The Mirror World case is actually a really interesting 14 case. David Gelertner had these patents. On some of the 15 things, like the cover flow thing that Apple has right now
- where you can scroll through and then the page that you're 16
- 17 looking at highlights large, and then also this automatic
- 18 archiving software. There was a spotlight type of thing.
- Apple was practicing this on their iPods, their iPads, their 19
- 20 MacBooks, and we represented the inventor, Gelertner, who had
- 21 these three patents on these technologies that Apple was
- 22 accused of infringing.
- 23 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, what time does the Court break
- 24 for lunch?
- 25 THE COURT: 1:00.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

At 1:00? MS. KLEIN:

THE COURT: Yes.

3 MS. KLEIN: Since it's 4 minutes to one, is it okay to

take a break right now?

THE COURT: Why do we do that?

I was going to start another line of MS. KLEIN:

questioning.

THE COURT: Start it. It's a nonjury trial.

MS. KLEIN: I would like to hand the witness select parts of Exhibits I and J, and this is one of the ones that was huge and we did compile that. So I have a copy for everybody.

- Ms. Romano, are you familiar with this group of documents?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 And can you tell us what this is?
- This is information that is related to an exhibit from the 15 Α. Sobieski case. 16
- 17 Who were the consultants that worked on this case?
- 18 I think at some point it was all three of us, but it was
- 19 predominantly Adina.
- 20 Q. And looking at these documents, how can you tell that Ms.
- 21 Kadden worked on this document? Was the consultant working on
- 22 this case?
- 23 A. I can tell her handwriting.
- 24 THE COURT: Doesn't she agree she worked on these,
- 25 Mr. Risk, when you look through them?

She was involved in the Sobieski case and 1 MR. RISK: her initials are on one or more of these documents. 2 3 THE COURT: And her handwriting? 4 MR. RISK: Somewhere, yes. 5 THE COURT: She can look through it and tell whether 6 her handwriting and initials were there? 7 MS. KADDEN: Yes. 8 THE COURT: Some? 9 MS. KADDEN: Yes. MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I move to have this admitted. 10 11 THE COURT: Yes. All right. 12 MS. KLEIN: Just for ease of convenience, should we do 13 it as a new number because it's parts of I and J? 14 THE COURT: You called it I and J1. That's the new 15 number. MS. KLEIN: But it's not all I and J1. 16 17 THE COURT: I and J1 is the big one? MS. KLEIN: J1 is the huge one. This has two pages. 18 19 The way that the graphics are maintained at Visualex's normal 20 course of business is the graphics and how it's produced and 21 all the work of the consultants, their recommendations are in 22 one thing called an envelope folder, and e-mail written 23 communications about the consulting are separate. So in order 24 that one can see the particular things, we have put them 25 together.

- THE COURT: Why don't you call it I and J1 excerpt?
- 2 MS. KLEIN: Good. That's perfect. Thank you.
- 3 THE COURT: I and J1 excerpt is received.
 - MR. RISK: No objection.
 - (Defendant's Exhibit I and J1 excerpt received in evidence)
 - MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I'd like to show the witness another excerpt of it, if I may approach. The front page of this is VIS 747.
 - Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 11 | A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- 12 | Q. And can you tell us what this is?
- 13 A. It's an e-mail string between Adina and an attorney from
 14 Stroock working on the Sobieski matter.
- 15 Q. In reviewing this document, can you tell whether or not Ms.
- 16 Kadden was acting in a consulting capacity?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- Q. Can you explain to us what she was doing in connection with this?
- 20 | A. Well, she is evaluating the request by the client. If you
- 21 look down at the bottom, which is the first e-mail from Bill
- 22 | Seymour, he is asking, can we make sure that the small circle
- 23 | is 1 percent by area the size of the larger circle, which,
- 24 | again, if she was a wrist, the answer to that would be
- 25 unequivocally yes. But because she is a consultant, what she

- actually is telling him is that, it's actually -- it's 75

 percent of 1 percent, as the label says less than 1 percent.
- 3 Do you want the size changed to 1 percent or remove the less
- 4 | than text? She is basically saying what you are asking doesn't
- 5 make sense because she is evaluating that information and
- 6 saying, well, if the label says less than 1 percent and we are
- 7 | showing it as 1 percent, then that would be -- it would be
- 8 confusing to a jury. So she is basically alerting the attorney
- 9 to the fact that what he's asking for doesn't make sense.
- 10 | Q. In connection with this exhibit that you're looking at in
- 11 | this e-mail, did that ultimately become a demonstrative
- 12 | exhibit?
- 13 A. I'm sorry. Can you say that again?
- 14 Q. Yes. Did the work that Ms. Kadden is talking about in this
- 15 e-mail ultimately become a graphic?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Is the graphic in the package?
- 18 | A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And can you tell me whether or not her advice was followed?
- 20 A. Yes. If you look at VIS 1215, it looks like her advice was
- 21 followed.
- 22 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I move to have this admitted
- 23 | also as the summary and it's J5 and I, summary 2.
- MR. RISK: I have no objection. It's not a summary.
- 25 THE COURT: Excerpt. Excerpt 2.

Case 1:11-cv-04892-SAS Document 25 Filed 08/29/12 Page 107 of 170 107

C8DMKADT Romano - direct Now we managed to run the clock until 1:00. We will take our luncheon recess now until 10 after 2. (Luncheon recess)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Your Honor, may we approach the side bar

It can be. Just in trying to figure out

2

1

2:15 p.m.

MS. KLEIN:

3

4 with you?

5

THE COURT: It can't be done in open court?

6

MS. KLEIN: 7

how to best sort of expedite this and not waste everyone's

8

time, one of the possible options that I thought would work is,

9

the long time period is going to be going through her time

10

sheets, adjustments, things like that.

11

THE COURT: Which you keep pointing out won't be

12

necessary, depending on these economics and the decision.

13

MS. KLEIN: One of the things I was wondering, is it possible or feasible for the Court that we take all of the

14 15

testimony relating to obviously the position, what she did,

16

things like that, possibly the good-faith issue, so we wouldn't

Ms. Kadden has testified at her deposition that her

17

have to call any witnesses back in regards to that.

18

handwritten notes were accurate. The time sheets are her

19 20

entries that she put in. And it's really mechanical of going

21

through. I would be just as happy, if the Court would so

22

indulge, if and when you issue your ruling --

23

THE COURT: On exempt, nonexempt?

24

25

Based on that ruling, if you find it MS. KLEIN: Yes. exempted, it doesn't matter what time she comes. She was free

T Romano - direct

to do what she did. In the event that you find that she is nonexempted before we close the official sort of record, if the parties could then maybe on submission — it's numbers and it's going through — I'm happy to have Ms. Kadden, we will read in the testimony about her handwritten notes.

THE COURT: It's okay with me if it's okay with Mr. Risk.

MR. RISK: The time sheets are the time sheets, as far as we are concerned. These handwritten notes are nowhere in the record for this trial, so an examination comparing handwritten notes that are not exhibits with official time sheets that are. I don't care how the Court wants to do it, but I think those handwritten notes are out of play.

MS. KLEIN: You produced them. They are hers. She maintained them in this case and she said that they were accurate and they are reflected as to what she did. If it says arrived 9:35, leave 6:00, I don't know how she can dispute that.

MR. RISK: Your Honor's pretrial order says in the strongest terms that that exhibit list is final and we have operated that way. And those handwritten notes are nowhere in the record for this trial right now.

MS. KLEIN: I can use them for impeachment to cross her. Again, she testified at her deposition that they are accurate.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: They are an admission of a party. I don't see any problem with using them. They are a party admission. She already acknowledged that at her deposition.

MR. RISK: We think the time sheets are the official record and we are fighting over nickels and dimes, but we will do it in the way that the Court wants to do it, fine.

MS. KLEIN: The problem with the time records is, Ms. Kadden already testified that, no matter what, they accounted in the time system for eight hours. So even if you came in at 2, she would write two hours general, which meant she didn't come in until 10. Again, what shows that is her handwritten record when she wrote the day, contemporaneous notes, arrived, left early.

THE COURT: What are these notes written on, on a calendar?

MR. RISK: Your Honor, she wrote handwritten notes, which were the basis for then what she entered on the computer. Ms. Klein is going to spend apparently a lot of our time comparing the handwritten notes to the computer entries and when the time comes she will testify about it.

THE COURT: Whatever.

Let's use our time remaining today. Let's keep going.

MS. KLEIN: I guess I wanted to know how much to cover with Ms. Romano, whether we should start going over on her time sheets the comp she was paid.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Romano - direct

THE COURT: 1 No.

We will submit that after? MS. KLEIN:

3 THE COURT: Yes.

MS. KLEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

Just so I am clear on the record, we are going to put in all the information that shows relevance towards just strictly the exemption/nonexemption and not damages. correct for now?

THE COURT: No. You said you were going to cover the good faith.

MS. KLEIN: Good faith, because it's not numbers, correct.

- 13 BY MS. KLEIN:
- 14 Q. Ms. Romano, do you still have what we marked as Exhibit
- 15 IJ1 --
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. -- in front of you, the excerpt. I would like you to look 17
- 18 at the one because they look alike. They are similar.
- 19 front page is the one that bears VIS 01103?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 THE COURT: I have it.
- 22 Can you explain to us what is going on in this group of
- 23 documents in regards to this demonstrative exhibit that was
- 24 produced for the plaintiff?
- This is basically a collection of the materials that are in 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

an exhibit envelope and also along with some communications from the client, and it's a good representation of how an exhibit evolves kind of from start to finish.

- Can you take us through how it evolves? Q.
- Yeah. Obviously, the first thing that you do is, you are reading background materials, and sometimes you have a conversation with the client, sometimes not. That depends on the circumstance.

But when the client decides, yes, we want to go forward with a particular exhibit that you had recommended, they didn't have to provide the actual content information that has to be utilized in developing the graphic. So this first page is basically the trial team sending us the names and the dates of the predecessors of Sobieski that is going to be utilized to start the creation of the graphic.

And so what the consultant does is receives the information and sometimes it's what you expected. They say, I'll send you the names and you have an idea in your head. Sometimes it's what you expected to receive and sometimes it's not. If it's not, then, again, there is a communication with the client saying, hey, you know, we talked about doing this flow chart and what you sent me really doesn't make sense to do Sometimes at that point it changes into something else, but if it's what you requested from the client, then the next step is, if you go to VIS 1105 and 1104, if you could put those

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

side by side, because it was actually too big to put on a portrait one, so it's two pieces.

This is a form that the consultant fills out when putting -- before anything gets put into the studio. called a chart type form. And what the consultant is doing is, you know, it's identifying the case number because a lot of times we have multiple cases in the studio at the same time, giving it an exhibit number. This is the first exhibit created for this case. Also identifying when you think it's going to be used. This particular one was at this point being created for use in opening.

And then the next thing is to craft the title, which obviously is a really important thing. This one is not earth shattering, but many of them are, as far as giving the takeaway. And the information that was in that e-mail, the party names and the dates, then is communicated to the studio, that the consultant feels the best way to portray this is kind of a flow chart with dates up at the top, names of the companies at the next level. And if there are pictures of the liquor that was actually being created -- sold by these companies, it was going to be in there.

Just to back up one second, this -- the allegation in this case is that Sobieski, who is our client, misappropriated the name Krupnik when they were selling their honey liquor, and they used this other trademarked -- I think it's German name.

MKADT Romano - direct

Our point is, it wasn't us, basically, and that we did not misappropriate their trademark. It was — actually got out on the Internet and ended up on our website and we weren't responsible for it. Anyway, we were going to put pictures. We were recommending that the best thing to do is to put pictures of the various types of honey liquor within each box that goes with the predecessor.

So what happens at this point is, again, the consultant is generating all this information. The back of that sheet, it's actually like a carbon paper, but it's really not carbon paper. It's called the yellow sheet. What you write on it goes through to the back. That gets given to the production coordinator so he can keep track of every exhibit in the case and generate what's called a client status report so that everybody always knows how many graphics and what graphics are in the studio for a given case.

And then the next thing that consultant does is takes this envelope, and the pictures would have been in there as well, that they are going to use, as far as using for the images of the bottles, and then they would have what's called a briefing session with the art director who is assigned to the case. And in the briefing session, basically, the consultant is explaining to the art director not only the overall strategy, visual strategy of the case, but how this exhibit fits in and what the takeaway from this exhibit needs to be and

TADT Romano - direct

also explains where the information that we say, we have bottles of the images in the file on the server. So they have a good understanding of what needs to be communicated by the layout.

And so, basically, then the art director goes back and either he creates the layout or he directs the designers to create the layout the way he wants it to be created. For example, there is a grid. Every exhibit has a grid. So titles don't jump around when you scroll from one to the other. So those kinds of things he is telling them what typeface to use. Those kinds of things.

So what then happens is the designer or the art director, I guess -- just globally I'll call them the studio -- generates a layout, which is VIS 1100, and you will be able to see from that that the layout actually looks pretty much the way the consultant had requested it.

And so what happens, and I should back up because this is a really important part of the whole process, is so if the designer creates it, it goes back to the art director. There is a pretty elaborate proofing process in place because we don't want any mistakes to get out of our office to the clients. And so the first thing, part of the proofing process is the designer who creates it is obviously proofing their own work to make sure that they did everything they were told to do, and then they pass it on to the art director. And the art

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

director is looking at it from an aesthetic standpoint. they snap to the grid? Did they put the title on the right

spot? Did they use, you know, franklin gothic and not

helvetica, all these kinds of things he is looking for from

that standpoint.

It then goes to the production coordinator because the production coordinator has a list that's generated from the consultant of all the things that need to go out in this presentation. When it comes to the production coordinator, he checks it off, says okay it's done, and he is proofing for just blatant errors. Is something misspelled? Is the word that the consultant put on this page, is it on this graphic? actually pretty comical because sometimes if the consultant misspells a word, the production coordinator will sign off on it, concedes it's spelled wrong, so we are going to spell concedes wrong.

Then he brings it to the consultants. The consultants are proofing for a very different purpose. The consultants are evaluating the layout for the takeaway. Does it do what it's supposed to do, A? And, B, if the answer to that is yes, is there anything that we can do to make us work harder, to help the client communicate their point and ultimately win the case? If the consultants all agree, yes, this is great, then we send the file, we tell the production coordinator, okay, it's good, he puts it in Power Point and he sends it to the client for

review.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What then happens is, once the attorneys see it, they may have additional changes that they want to have done because once they see it on paper they realize, oh, jeez, it doesn't communicate this other point that we have to make, and so they will communicate to us what changes they want to have made. Ιf you look at VIS 1102, this is information that the client is sending us and, lo and behold, the client says, hey, I told you there was this one thing happening, but there was also this licensing agreement which is an important issue in the case and we would like to add that.

Obviously, there is a lot more information on this chart than there was on the one that we previously created. As a consultant you say, okay, can I work this into the layout that was created the first time? And if the answer to that is no, I can't squish it there. Then you have to completely reevaluate your approach and say, okay, well, was the flow chart type of approach the way to go? And the answer is, obviously, this won't work. As a flow chart there is too much on there.

- Q. Ms. Romano, when you said whether or not you could smush it onto the flow chart, physically, could it be done that this stuff would go on it?
- It could, but it wouldn't be very effective. Everything would get much smaller and you are not going to be able to do

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the comparison between these two events running at the same time.

So what the consultant then does is he communicates with the client and says, obviously, there is new information on this now that we need to include. We can't fit it the way it's currently designed. Tell us why this is important so we can recraft this, reevaluate our approach to do something that is going to work harder to communicate the point you are trying to communicate. And you can see what you do once you come up with the new approach, you pull that exhibit envelope and there is a tissue paper over the top, it's called flapping. that's the way that you write things on there to communicate to the studio what changes need to be made. If you look at VIS 1099, you can see that we are actually writing the revisions on there that need to be made to this.

And so the process starts all over again. designer is creating the layout, it goes back to the art director, the art director is proofing for aesthetic reasons, aesthetic things, then it goes back to the production coordinator, who checks it off, based on the sheet, it's called the conference report that the consultant generates, indicating that this needs to be revised and resent.

And then it goes back to the consultants who are saying, okay, A, did the changes I asked to be made, were they made and, B, even though I asked them to do it this way, does

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If the answer to that is no, then you say, I think it work? there is a better way to do this and it goes back into the studio again and you go back to the art director and you say, you know what, it's just not working hard enough. It's just not doing what it's supposed to do. I think maybe we should try something else.

And so you can see, the next one, 1098, is the art director does what he is told to do by the consultant. But then if you look at 1097, the consultant is not happy with it. It's not -- it's not working hard enough. And so you can see all of the markings on it. The text could be larger, you need to be able to read it.

And then why are we, all of a sudden, introducing a new color? Is that helping us or hurt us? Is it making it more confusing? Don't change the color. The color on the top of the flag shouldn't be gray. It should be blue. give ownership that this is the -- our client that we are talking about. Goes back into the studio, process starts all over again. The studio generates another draft, VIS 1095, goes back through the proofing process again, the consultants are still not happy with it. It's still too small. And there is all this extra space up at the top being used for the title band. Lose the title bands. Lift up the flags. Make the text larger. It's got to be easier to read. If we are going to send this to our client, it's not going to work hard enough to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

help them communicate their case. It goes back into the studio The studio generates another layout, which is VIS 1101. again. Ms. Romano, who are the consultants that are working on this particular exhibit that we are looking at? A. It's my initials and Adina's initials. And, obviously, that's the other thing. At the proofing process, everybody who looks at it signs it. So if a mistake gets to the client, you know how to -- basically, you have to work a little bit harder, you signed off on it and there is a mistake in it. But the two consultants that are signing off on this is Adina and myself. And there is some, towards the end here that it's just Adina. It's not even my initials. That happens when people get pulled onto different things. For example, on 1095, VIS 1095, it's Abdul's initials and Adina's initials, not mine.

Anyway, once the layout is approved internally, all of the consultants and the art director feel that it is the best that we can do to communicate the point that the clients need to communicate in order to persuade the trier of fact about this argument, we then let the production coordinator know, yes, it's good, it goes to the Power Point file and it gets posted to the client for review.

Then the client, if you look at VIS 1101, the client makes additional changes. Again, the consultants are always evaluating every single change that comes in that is requested by the client, does it help or hurt the takeaway. Does it help

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the exhibit communicate what it needs to communicate, or does it hurt it? Can we keep it within this format or do we have to find a different approach? If we have to find a different approach, again, it's up to the consultant to decide how to manage the expectations of the clients. You want to make sure that they understand why you are doing what you are doing. So sometimes it can be a complete deviation from what they had seen before. You want to prime them for that so they don't open it up and say, oh, my God, what did you do. You want to say, okay, by adding this information, all the text is going to be small and you are not going to be able to read it, so we recommend we are going to do this, would you like us to try it. At that point they usually say yes or they say, yes, do it your way, and can we see it our way, too, so we can see which works better.

Once the consultant has a plan for how they are going to change the exhibit so that it can accommodate the requested changes, writes it on the tissue again, goes back through the whole process again, that's VIS 1093, you can see that Adina is making notes. She adds the title collectively Sobieski. is changing things to all caps. She is also directing the studio to modify the images a little bit for the coloring, because the coloring of the liquor in the bottle had a strategic importance. And then this, again, I am not going to beat a dead horse, it keeps going through the process until the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

consultants agree that it communicates what the clients need to communicate.

And then it is, again, sent to the client for review. The client then -- you can see, we communicate with clients in different ways. Sometimes for the really complicated revisions they actually call us because it's a lot more efficient than trying to memorialize something in an e-mail, or sometimes they really can't even articulate what they want. They can tell you what they don't like about it, but they can't articulate what they want. That's usually a phone call. Or they send you with a PDF with markups, or on VIS 676, they send you an e-mail that kind of explains what they want.

On this one, whenever you have questions, concerns with the client, again, it's your job as the consultant to manage the expectations. You never just blindly follow. you have questions, concerns, recommendations, you always let them know. You can see at the bottom Adina is saying. Hi, Matt, please give me a call on my cell phone. Obviously, there is something in this e-mail that she has concerns about that she doesn't understand that she wants to make recommendations about. It's really literally a chess game. Every move you make may cause the client to make a different move and the process never stops until the final file is delivered, and even sometimes it doesn't stop then when you had to e-mail a tech in the courtroom a change. Until it goes up on the screen, it's a

KADT Romano - direct

complete iterative process and at every step of the way the consultant is making recommendations as the best way to communicate the information.

Q. Thank you.

MS. KLEIN: I'd like to hand the witness what we will mark as excerpt 3. It's also selections from Exhibit J through 3. It will be a much shorter thing.

THE COURT: I don't think I need more of this to understand the process. I think you are wasting my time now. I have got this. I told you I got this. This is a matter of legal determination now. I know what the person does.

MS. KLEIN: I believe that Mr. Risk, based on what we said right before we went on break, was suggesting that Ms. Kadden did not do this work. And, again --

THE COURT: I think you shouldn't anticipate what he is saying. Her signature is on it. Her notes are on it. She will testify to it herself. If there is a direct conflict and she says, I didn't do all those things that Ms. Romano said, that's what she will say under oath. It's unlikely since her signature is all over it and her handwriting. Sounds like it's her job.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, if I can have two minutes and one short one and I'll be done because what you've indicated.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. KLEIN: I would like to hand the witness excerpt

3.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

19

20

21

THE COURT: Excerpt 3 is all e-mails.

- Q. Ms. Romano, please take a look through what is marked VIS 00702, 701, 700, 699, and 698, and 697.
 - Can you just take a quick look at this and tell me whether or not you recognize this document?
 - Α. Yes.
 - And as this a document that was kept in the ordinary course of Visualex's business?
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 Can you tell us what this document is?
- 12 It's an e-mail string that's communications between 13 Visualex consultants. Specifically, most of these look like
- 14 they are going back and forth between Adina and the trial team
- at Stroock that's working on the Sobieski case. 15
- MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I would like to move this into 16 17 evidence.
 - THE COURT: I can't imagine any objection. These are communications from Ms. Kadden.
 - MR. RISK: We have no objection. They are not a business record. But we have no objection.
- 22 THE COURT: I agree. They are the state of a party 23 opponent.
- 24 Q. Ms. Romano, in looking at these can you please tell me 25 whether or not Ms. Kadden was acting in her role as a

consultant?

Yes. Α.

1

- 3 Can you tell us what in these documents allows you to 4 conclude that?
- 5 A. Well, on VIS 700, Bill Seymour sends an e-mail that says:
- 6 Hi, Adina, can we put a shipping container in the last picture
- 7 on a truck? And as a consultant, as she is supposed to do, she
- is evaluating whether or not the answer to that is yes. 8
- 9 we? Absolutely. Can we? Is it the right thing to do? As a
- 10 consultant, obviously, she does not recommend it. And she
- 11 explains why, which is her job to explain why she doesn't
- recommend it. It doesn't look like the distributor icon on 12
- 13 graphic 5, and we also have the shipping container box on the
- 14 left side. I would not want to put that one on the truck
- 15 because it will be the same as a distributor box. Of course,
- all distributing container boxes should have the same icon to 16
- 17 reinforce the imagery. What she is basically saying to the
- client, sure, we can do it, but we don't recommend it because 18
- you are using the same icons for two different things, which 19
- 20 could be quite confusing.
- 21 Same imagery or icon? Q.
- 22 Imagery, icon. It's the same thing.
- 23 Is this excerpt 3 that's been admitted into evidence
- 24 typical of the work that Ms. Kadden did throughout the entirety
- 25 of her employment?

Α. Yes.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 2 Objection. Leading. MR. RISK:
- 3 THE COURT: Overruled.
 - Then, as I was explaining, it is like a chess game. If you Α. look at VIS 701, the attorney responds and basically agrees with this suggestion and then explains what he says is, he is giving more information. We are actually saying that these two steps do perform the same function, but from a different perspective. So they are collaborating on well, okay, I understand what you are telling me, that you don't want to confuse the jury by using the same thing for two -- the same imagery for two different things, but he is then saying, okay, I understand that, but it actually sort of is the same

function. They are working together to come up with, based on

- 15 her advice, her coming up with what makes the most sense for them and to communicate their takeaway as effectively as 16 17 possible.
- 18 Q. Thank you, Ms. Romano.
- Within the Visualex offices during the time that Ms. 19
- 20 Kadden worked there, was there a time keeping system?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 Q. Let me rephrase that. Was there a manner for employees to
- 23 keep track of what they were doing?
- 24 Α. Yes.

25

Do you know the name of the system that is used?

- It's QuickBooks. Α.
- Can you just explain to us very simply the process of how 2 Q.
- 3 the employees keep track of their time?
- 4 Basically, when you are working -- you have task codes that Α.
- 5 you choose, so if you are working on a case you pick the case
- 6 name so that time, if it's billable, can be billed to the
- 7 correct case number. Then you pick a task code of what you are
- doing and there is several different ones. You can be 8
- 9 consulting, you can be project management, depending on what
- 10 you were doing. Then you write a description explaining what
- 11 you were doing and then you put the amount of time. We bill in
- 12 six-minute increments. So six minutes is equal to .1.
- 13 basically put in the amount of time that you were spending
- 14 doing that task.
- 15 And are there, in the QuickBooks, different time rates for
- the same item of book? For example, is there an overtime rate 16
- 17 and a day rate?
- 18 In QuickBooks? Α.
- 19 Um-hum. Q.
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 What is that for? Q.
- 22 That is -- it's an internal tracking of how much it's
- 23 actually costing us to -- it's just an internal tracking of
- 24 whether we are going to work extra hours on cases.
- 25 And is the overtime rate that's indicated on those

Romano - direct

- indicative of the fact that a client will absolutely pay an additional fee?
- 3 | A. No.

9

25

- 4 Q. Can you explain that?
- A. Because what happens a lot of times is that there are
 multiple cases in the studio at the same time. And because of
 that, something slipped past 6:00 and people are working late
 to meet all the deadlines, but it's not the client's fault so
- 10 | Q. And, yet, would an employee put that rate in?

that we don't charge them overtime for it.

- 11 A. No. They shouldn't.
- 12 | Q. They should not?
- 13 A. They should not.
- Q. Is there anything in QuickBooks that would accurately reflect an employee taking client revisions?
- 16 A. Yes. But it depends on -- when you say taking client 17 revisions, taking them from whom? There is different things.
- 18 A consultant would put that down as consulting time because
- 19 they are actually reacting to client requests and evaluating
- 20 whether or not that makes sense. But the designers have to
- 21 execute the revisions that the consultants decide to do. The
- 22 designers have to execute that and they would put that down.
- 23 | They would put it actually under the task client revisions
- 24 where the client would put it down under consulting.
 - Q. If the consultant was not acting in a consulting role, what

Romano - direct

- would he put it as? 1
- Why would a consultant not be acting in a consulting role? 2 Α.
- 3 Are there any circumstances or times where they are not
- 4 working as a consultant?
 - When they are working on case work?
- 6 Uh-huh. Ο.

5

- 7 I mean, you're always a consultant. You don't put on a
- consultant hat or not a consultant hat. There are certain 8
- 9 tasks that you perform as a consultant which you don't want to
- 10 charge the client a high rate for that are more logistical in
- 11 nature where you might be finding vendors to print boards in
- 12 Texarkana and you would charge that under product management,
- 13 not you weren't consulting, but because you were doing
- 14 something that you didn't want to charge that high rate for.
- 15 Ο. Have you had an opportunity to look through Ms. Kadden's
- time sheets in connection with this lawsuit? 16
- 17 Α. Yes.

- And do you know how she described the majority of her work?
- 19 As consulting. Α.
- 20 Did there come a point in time in Visualex's existence that
- 21 you decided to change the compensation scheme for the
- 22 professional staff?
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 Ο. And when was that?
- 25 It was in, I think, March of 2009. Α.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Can you explain for me the reason that Visualex made the business decision to change the compensation structure for the professional staff?

Yes. That was right about the time when the economy took a downturn and it was pretty much unprecedented in the legal industry the ramifications that that had on the legal industry. So attorneys weren't getting cases and, therefore, we weren't getting cases because we work with attorneys. That, coupled with a case that we had done where the invoice was about \$180,000 and the ultimate client, SGI, went bankrupt, Silicon Graphics, and the law firm informed us that they would not be paying the bill because their client hadn't paid them, and about \$80,000 of that invoice was direct expenses, equipment rental, hotel rooms, things that I had paid out of pocket.

And so not only were we not going to receive \$180,000 that we were expecting to receive, but 80,000 of that was out-of-pocket expenses. And so that, coupled with the fact that in 2009 the first three months we had the worst three months of our entire history, we really had no active cases and no billable work, we had to sit down, the three owners, and have some difficult conversations about where -- are we going to be able to weather this storm? If so, what do we need to do in order to get through the other side.

Can you tell me, before changing the compensation scheme, what, if anything, did you do?

6

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

23

C8DMKADT Romano - direct

last November. But that wasn't enough.

- The first thing we did is the two owners, Brian and myself, 1 2 who drew salaries because we actually work in the company, 3 also, dropped drawing salaries. And we actually -- that's 4 still in practice right now. We have not drawn salaries since
 - THE COURT: You mean November '11?
- 7 THE WITNESS: '11, yeah.
 - A. And we waited to see how -- if that was going to make any difference, but you want to be able to make payroll. You have to make payroll. If there is no money coming in, you have to start evaluating other areas. So we made a very, very difficult decision to lay off one of our designers.
- 13 Q. Ms. Romano, I'm sorry. Maybe I didn't hear. You stopped 14 drawing salaries before or after the change?
- A. Before. 15
 - MR. RISK: Object to this line on the grounds of relevance.
- 18 THE COURT: I heard it all in opening statement. That's their theory, this is what they call incentive pay, not 19 20 overtime, and they couldn't afford incentive pay anymore. I am 21 not sure I see the relevance either. Maybe it goes to good 22 faith. I don't know. But I'm listening to it.
 - In response to the Court's inquiry, I believe --
- 24 Α. We are still not.
- 25 THE COURT: She said starting November 2011 --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Romano - direct

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I misunderstood. We have not drawn a salary since -- in other words, I have not.

THE COURT: You said that, November 11, 2011.

THE WITNESS: It started back -- I think we stopped taking salaries in January of 2009. I'm still not taking a salary is basically what I'm saying.

THE COURT: Why did you bother telling me about 2011, November? What was the point of that?

THE WITNESS: In other words --

THE COURT: Now you are saying since January '09 you have not taken a salary?

THE WITNESS: In other words, when money came in, we would draw some, but we are behind in salary since -- we are behind in salary since November of 2011. We stopped taking a consistent salary, I guess I should say, in 2009.

THE COURT: But you paid yourselves at intervals since January 2009.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

- What, if anything, else did Visualex do at that time before considering the change for the staff?
- We laid off a designer. Α.
- Were there any other changes made? 0.
- Α. Yeah. That still wasn't enough. And you get to a point when you're in the business that we are in that you have to have enough staff to be able to handle cases when they came in,

those kinds of things.

Romano - direct

- and we hoped that they would start coming in again. So we had
 gotten lean as we felt we could on the employee side. And so
 then we started looking at leases. Could we renegotiate
 leases. We put a hold on all software and hardware purchasing,
 - MS. KLEIN: I'll come back to this, your Honor, because it's going to get into the issue of the attorney-client privilege. For now if I can skip this and then I'll come back in just a couple of minutes.
 - Q. Before we get to some additional questions on that, I would like to talk about, is there a difference between the way compensation is paid to the professional and nonprofessional staff?
- 14 A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

- Q. Is there different benefits, paid time off, that sort of thing?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- Q. What types of I'll call them perks or things does the professional staff get that the nonprofessional staff does not get?
- A. They get what we call comp time, which is if you work a lot of hours, we say take the day off and just put it down as comp time, you don't have to come to work, but obviously you're still getting paid for it.
 - Q. Did Ms. Kadden, was she given comp time?

KADT Romano - direct

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Would she have gotten that comp time if she was not an
- 3 exempt employee?
- 4 | A. No.
- 5 Q. Are there any other types of things that exempt staff gets
- 6 | that nonexempt doesn't?
- 7 A. Well, what do you mean, any types of things?
- Q. Are there any other distinguishing factors in the amount of
- 9 | their compensation, things of that sort?
- 10 A. The professional staff obviously have much higher salaries
- 11 | than the nonprofessional staff.
- 12 | Q. Do you know approximately how much different?
- 13 A. Considerably different, 30 or \$40,000.
- 14 | Q. You've had an opportunity to review Ms. Kadden's time
- 15 | sheets?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Were there times that she improperly characterized her paid
- 18 | time off?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. Can you just give us an example of that?
- 21 | A. I think there was a time where she characterized something
- 22 | as holiday and it wasn't a holiday. There was times when she
- 23 characterized something as sick time and it said, you know, car
- 24 | trouble. There are times she put things down administrative
- 25 | time and it was snow day. She couldn't get in because of the

snow.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Were the other employees, did they report to work on those 2 3 davs?
 - A. On -- sometimes -- there is a difference between when there was a snow day and we closed the office and there was a day when there was snow and the office was opening and other people were there and Adina was not able to make it in because she lived pretty far away.
 - Q. For all of this time that you have now seen was improperly entered, was she compensated?
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Would she have been compensated if she was an hourly 13 employee?
- 14 A. No.
 - MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, at this time, in light of the fact we are not going to make the decision about the work, the only way I see it is for me to question the witness about the good faith. And if that's the case, I guess maybe we should go off of the record for a couple of seconds and I give the documents to Mr. Risk. Is that appropriate? I want him to have an opportunity to see it.
 - THE COURT: Sounds good.
 - MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, can I ask one very specific Obviously, the attorney-client privilege is such a highly important privilege. Is the waiving of it limited to

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

Romano - direct

the issue concerning --1 THE COURT: It is, absolutely. It's a narrow waiver. 2 3 It's limited solely to the document or documents that we have 4 already discussed and I've ruled on. That's it. It is court 5 ordered.

MS. KLEIN: It's not an open waiver?

THE COURT: No.

MS. KLEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

Mark, do you want to take a break and see the documents or do you want to see the doctor?

MR. RISK: May we take a five-minute break, your Honor?

THE COURT: I quess so.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Are we ready?

MS. KLEIN: Yes.

MR. RISK: I just got the documents.

THE COURT: I'm just asking.

Sorry, your Honor. Ms. Klein can proceed. MR. RISK:

I have given them the once over.

THE COURT: Good. Okay.

- 22 Q. Ms. Romano, was there any time during Ms. Kadden's
- 23 employment that she was not allowed to interact with clients?
- 24 Α. No.
 - Were there any restrictions on her acting as a consultant?

No.

Α.

- Did she regularly, as part of her duties and 2
- 3 responsibilities, review all of the background material that
- 4 you testified about today in the same manner that you did?
- 5 A. Yes.
- Was she expected to consult in the same manner that you 6
- 7 did?
- A. Yes. 8
- 9 Was she expected to provide consulting about the images in
- 10 the same method as Kim Nawyn?
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Was Kim Nawyn Ms. Kadden's boss?
- 13 Α. No.
- 14 We talked about before things that led up to your Visualex
- 15 having to make a business decision to change the compensation,
- 16 is that correct?
- 17 Yes. Α.
- 18 And at some point a decision was made?
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 And what was that decision? 0.
- That we were going to suspend paying overtime incentive 21
- 22 compensation.
- 23 And did you do that blindly as a business decision?
- 24 Blindly? I wouldn't say blindly. I weighed all of the
- 25 options. We weighed all of the options, we meaning the owners.

Romano - direct

- Q. And can you explain to the Court what steps -- let me retract that. Do you believe that graphic consultants are
- 3 exempt?
- 4 A. Yes.

5

9

11

12

- Q. Can you explain to us why you believe that?
- A. Because I worked as a graphic consultant myself for 20
 years and was always paid as an exempt employee. Every other
 graphic consultant I have ever come in contact with at every

company in this industry was paid as an exempt employee.

- 10 | Q. And were there any other reasons? Strike that.
 - So there came a point in time where you made the decision to change the compensation structure?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And before doing that did you consult with anybody?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. Did you take any independent steps?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- Q. Can you explain to the Court exactly what the process was of what you did?
- 20 A. Well, the first thing I did was contact an attorney, and
- 21 really my question at that point was, have these offer letters
- 22 that say that these at-will employees are going to get overtime
- 23 compensation because that's in their offer letter, do I have
- 24 | to -- am I allowed to change that?
- 25 | Q. Did you speak with an attorney?

Α. Yes.

1

4

9

- Who did you speak with? 2 Q.
- 3 Traycee Klein. Α.
 - And what, if anything, else was discussed? Q.
- 5 Actually, what Ms. Klein told me was that it wasn't an 6 employment contract and that because these professionals were 7 at-will employees that wasn't the issue that I had to be concerned about. I had to make sure that legally that the 8
- 10 believed.
- 11 Was that separate and apart from whether or not you had a 12 contract that required you to pay something?

characterization was correct as exempt employee that I

- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 And continue explaining to us what happened, to the best of your knowledge. 15
- To the best of my knowledge -- this is a little bizarre, 16
- 17 but Ms. Klein said she was busy and I could go to the
- Department of Labor and there would be summaries about, you 18
- know, what are the things that would characterize an employee 19
- 20 as exempt versus nonexempt and that I should review that and,
- 21 you know, basically there were little, you know, tests you can
- 22 do to go to the site and complete the test or the checklist.
- 23 Q. Do you recall whether or not in those conversations, was
- 24 that the only advice you got or that was just something you
- 25 started with until we spoke later?

Romano - direct

- 1 Α. Just starting with, yes.
- And did you proceed to the Department of Labor website? 2 Q.
- 3 Yes, I did. Α.
- 4 And did you follow what I believe is called E laws and the Q.
- 5 E advisor? Did you go through the tests?
- A. Yes, I did. 6
- 7 MR. RISK: Objection, leading.
- THE COURT: It's all been leading since this is an 8
- 9 area of attorney-client advice, but I think that's appropriate
- 10 to make sure that the waiver is narrow. It is leading, but I
- 11 am going to allow it. Go ahead.
- 12 Did you look for only specific exemptions or did you do it
- 13 based on just the actual job of the consultant?
- 14 A. Just the job of it. There was a bunch of different stuff
- 15 and I actually, from what I remember, I did all of them.
- Q. And as a result of your own going through that process, 16
- 17 what, if anything, did you conclude based on the Department of
- Labor information? 18
- 19 I concluded that the characterization as an exempt employee
- 20 was the correct characterization.
- 21 And did you at that point just decide to change the
- 22 compensation?
- 23 Α. No.
- 24 Was there further inquiry and steps taken? 0.
- 25 Α. Yes.

Romano - direct

- 1 | Q. What is the next thing that happened?
- 2 | A. I am not sure if we spoke on the phone, but we did have
- 3 | a -- I think it was both phone conversations and e-mails where
- 4 you requested that I send you any type of, you know,
- 5 descriptions, offer letters, any relevant information that
- 6 would enable you to evaluate it independently of what I had
- 7 | already done.
- 8 | Q. And did you ultimately send information over?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And was there any additional verbal discussion about what
- 11 | the job was?
- 12 | A. Yes. There was clarifications of things, sure.
- 13 | Q. And did you explain what the job of the consultant was that
- 14 Ms. Kadden did?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. Do you remember what happened next?
- 17 A. I believe you said you wanted to review it on your own and
- 18 | that you were also going to speak to -- I am not sure if it's
- 19 somebody else who works at your firm or I know that they had
- 20 been a prosecutor for the Department of Labor, and you were
- 21 | going to run it by them as well so that they could evaluate the
- 22 | information that I sent.
- 23 | Q. And did you ultimately get information back?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. And what were you told?

- Romano direct
- I was told that it was the correct characterization. 1
- 2 As a result of that, did you make any business decisions? Q.
- 3 Yes. We decided to suspend the overtime incentive
- compensation pay. 4
- 5 Did you make that announcement in writing?
- 6 Α. Yes.
- 7 After that announcement was distributed, what employees did
- that impact? 8
- 9 The professional staff, which at the time was Adina Kadden,
- 10 Kim Nawyn, Lance Sperring and Gerry Mooney.
- 11 What is Lance Sperring's job?
- 12 Α. Art director.
- 13 0. And what is Mr. Moony's job?
- Director of motion graphics. 14 Α.
- 15 Q. And Kim Nawyn?
- 16 Α. Consultant.
- 17 And the same position as Ms. Kadden?
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 After that announcement was made, was there an
- 20 understanding that employees from that point forward would only
- 21 work 40 hours a week?
- 22 A. No. And it wasn't just -- sorry to interrupt, but it
- 23 wasn't that I just put a letter in somebody's paycheck. I
- 24 called each one individually into my office, handed them the
- written communication, and I explained to them why we were 25

KADT Romano - direct

- doing it and that it was a difficult decision, but explained exactly why we had made the decision.
 - Q. And did you have a conversation with Ms. Kadden?
- 4 A. Yes.

3

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And do you recall advising her during that discussion that her annualized base salary was going to cover all of her hours
 - A. Yes.

worked?

- MR. RISK: Objection, leading.
- THE COURT: We discussed that. It is leading, but because it's the advice, I'm allowing it.
- MR. RISK: If I may, your Honor, this goes to the conversation between Ms. Romano and Ms. Kadden, and a predicate is being laid that's going to be of legal significance.
- THE COURT: Objection to leading, now that you are turning to that conversation, is sustained.
- Would you rephrase. You're going to basically ask her what she said and what the other party said in the conversation.
- Q. Can you tell us what happened at that meeting?
- A. Generally, yes. I don't obviously remember the exact words that were spoken. It was several years ago. But what I explained is that, you know, when times were good and we were able to pay incentive compensation, we did so, and we did so happily because we knew we wanted to keep employees, and we

- wanted to make sure they were incentivized along the way. But
 that when we didn't -- we no longer had the money to be able to
 make payroll, basically, let alone the additional incentive
 compensation, that we were all going to have to tighten our
 belts to get through this.
- Q. And what did you understand or Visualex understand at that point the \$75,000 was going to be for?
 - A. For her duties that she performed as a consultant for the year.
 - Q. Was it restricted in any way based on the amount of time she worked?
- 12 | A. No.

9

10

- MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I have no further questions.
- 14 THE COURT: Mr. Risk.
- 15 MR. RISK: Your Honor, I have some cross-examination.
- 16 | I would like to have the night to think of some cross --
- 17 THE COURT: I'm sure you won't finish the rest of it
 18 in one hour. We don't even have an hour. We have 45 minutes.
- MR. RISK: Can I take two minutes before we start the cross?
- 21 | THE COURT: Didn't you just have a break?
- 22 MR. RISK: I did.
- 23 THE COURT: We are going to be stopping early. I
 24 don't think I can stay until quarter after. We are going to
 25 stop at 4, quarter after, for the reasons previously discussed.

- 1 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 2 BY MR. RISK:
- 3 | Q. Ms. Romano, you have a bachelor's degree from CW Post
- 4 | College?
- 5 A. Correct.
- 6 Q. In psychology?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. You have a master's degree from Hofstra University?
- 9 A. Correct.
- 10 | Q. In applied research and evaluation?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 | Q. You obtained that in one year?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. And applied research and evaluation is industrial
- 15 | psychology, is that right?
- 16 A. It was in the industrial psychology program, yes.
- 17 | Q. And that's the scientific study of employees, workplaces
- 18 | and organizations?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. Then you took some education courses after that to be a
- 21 | teacher?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. And you have no schooling after that?
- 24 | A. No.
- 25 | Q. You have worked for many years in litigation graphics

- 1 | consulting?
- 2 | A. Yes.
- 3 | Q. First at Litigation Sciences?
- 4 A. Yes.
- $5 \parallel Q$. And then at FTI?
- 6 A. Yes. Well, Pixel before FTI.
- 7 | Q. Then at Pixel and then at FTI?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. In 2000, you formed Visualex, started Visualex?
- 10 | A. In 1999, the end of 1999.
- 11 Q. And you're the senior graphics consultant at Visualex?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Your hourly rate is higher than the hourly rate of the
- 14 | other consultants?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 Q. It's by about \$100?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And then your rate for services after 6:00 or on the
- 19 weekend would be 50 percent higher than your regular rate?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. So that's in the high fours?
- 22 A. Tell me that again.
- THE COURT: What is your regular rate?
- 24 THE WITNESS: 325. I never charge premium for my
- 25 | time.

THE COURT: You don't charge premium?

2 | THE WITNESS: I don't.

- 3 Q. Your rate for consulting activities was 325 when Ms. Kadden
- 4 was with Visualex, is that right?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And her rate for consulting activities was 225?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Now, the clients of Visualex are principally law firms?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 | Q. And some are major law firms?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. And some of the litigation Visualex works on are large
- 13 | litigations?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. Your clients include Stroock Stroock & Lavan?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. King & Spalding?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Dechert?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Paul Hastings?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Williams & Connolly?
- 24 | A. Yes.
- 25 Q. DLA Piper?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And these are not only firms located in New York, is that
- 3 || right?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. You have clients, major law firms in other cities around
- 6 | the country?
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 | Q. And Visualex supplies litigation graphics for cases being
- 9 | tried all over the country?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. You supplied graphics recently for a case that was tried in
- 12 | France, is that right?
- 13 A. For an arbitration, yes.
- 14 | Q. In 2008, you retained the Cowen Group to find you a new
- 15 | graphics consultant?
- 16 | A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. Cowen Group worked for Visualex?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. Well, they were hired -- go ahead.
- 20 A. Do you understand what a headhunter is? You don't hire
- 21 | them. We basically had three or four headhunters. They send
- 22 | you candidates. Once you choose one of their candidates, you
- 23 pay them a fee, but you don't hire them.
- 24 | Q. You paid a fee --
- 25 A. If you choose one of the candidates.

1 THE COURT: You did.

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

- 3 And Visualex prepared a job description for the position? 0.
 - Yes. Α.

4

5

7

- And then gave it to the Cowen Group?
- Yes. 6 Α.
 - Did you also give it to others?
 - The job description? I don't think so.
- 9 Is it the same job description that in 2009 you showed to
- 10 Ms. Klein when you consulted counsel about whether you had to
- 11 pay overtime to the graphics consultants?
- 12 There are a couple of job descriptions. I don't know if it
- 13 was that particular one. It was whatever one I had on my
- 14 computer. But it probably was, yes.
- 15 MR. RISK: Your Honor, may I approach the witness to
- show her Plaintiff's Exhibit 2? That's going to require me to 16
- 17 show one to the Court as well. Should I hand you my book or
- 18 you will just take Plaintiff's 2?
- 19 THE COURT: Whatever.
- 20 I'll give you one book at a time. MR. RISK:
- 21 THE COURT: Okay.
- 22 Are you going to be offering Plaintiff's Exhibit 2?
- 23 MR. RISK: Yes, I am.
- 24 THE COURT: Any objection, Ms. Klein?
- 25 I would just ask the witness if she wrote MS. KLEIN:

this document.

2 THE COURT: Let's start with, do you recognize this

3 document?

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

23

THE WITNESS: I recognize it because I have seen it in the production.

MR. RISK: Your Honor, may I be heard on this?

THE COURT: I don't know that anybody has to be heard

yet.

You do recognize it?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Is it a Visualex document?

12 THE WITNESS: Yes.

13 | THE COURT: It's prepared by your company?

THE WITNESS: Um-hum.

THE COURT: It's going to be admissible.

MS. KLEIN: I have no objection.

17 THE COURT: Exhibit 2 is received.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 received in evidence)

THE COURT: You didn't personally draft it.

THE WITNESS: I don't think I did.

MR. RISK: It's covered in admissions that I will

22 | introduce later.

THE COURT: What's covered in admissions?

MR. RISK: The relationship between Ms. Romano and

25 Exhibit 2.

1 THE COURT: What was the relationship between the two? Tell me now because she is not denying it's a Visualex 2 3 document. That's the defendant in this case and therefore it's

a statement of the defendant and therefore it's admitted.

don't understand.

MR. RISK: I'll proceed.

- Q. Ms. Romano, do you see about halfway down Exhibit 2 it While we prefer applicants with experience in the field, we are willing to train strong candidates?
- 10 Α. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

- 11 And that's the field of litigation graphics?
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 And Ms. Kadden, who was ultimately hired, had experience in 0. 14 the field?
- 15 Α. Yes.
- And Kim Matthiesen --16 0.
- 17 Nicole Matthiesen. Α.
- 18 Nicole Matthiesen, who was a graphics consultant prior to
- Ms. Kadden, she had experience in the field? 19
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 I'd like to show you another document that's been marked as 22 Plaintiff's Exhibit 12.
- 23 Your Honor, I think that's already in under MR. RISK: 24 another name.
- 25 I recognize it. It is. THE COURT: It is. What's

- the question about it? 1
- 2 MR. RISK: I have to find my copy, your Honor.
- 3 THE COURT: This is the gal who has got a master's in
- 4 English literature?
- 5 MR. RISK: Yes.
- Let me give you the official one, Ms. Romano. I'm sorry. 6
- 7 Ms. Matthiesen had experience in trial graphics?
- 8 Α. Yes.
- 9 She had that over two years, between 2004 and 2006? Q.
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 And she worked on a major litigation, didn't she?
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 And what litigation was that? Q.
- 14 The U.S. v. Jeffrey Skilling and Kenneth Lay case. Α.
- 15 Q. That's the Enron litigation, isn't it?
- Α. 16 Yes.
- 17 And she worked on graphics for the prosecution in that
- lawsuit? 18
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I object. The document speaks
- 21 for itself.
- 22 THE COURT: It does. I don't know why anybody wants
- 23 to waste my time.
- 24 MR. RISK: I won't, your Honor.
- 25 THE COURT: Good. It says right there, most recently

- worked as primary consultant with the prosecution in U.S. v. 1
- Jeffrey Skilling and Kenneth Lay, right there. 2
- 3 Q. I am going to show you Exhibit 9. I put before you Exhibit
- 4 9, Ms. Romano.
- 5 THE COURT: This is also in evidence under a different 6 exhibit number, but this is the Kim Nawyn résumé.
- 7 MR. RISK: Right.
 - I don't think we talked about it on your direct exam, but
 - Ms. Nawyn has experience in the field as well, doesn't she?
- 10 Α. Yes.

8

- She worked at Doar? 11 0.
- 12 Α. Correct.
- 13 Immediately prior to her joining Visualex? 0.
- 14 That's correct. Α.
- 15 Q. And I am going to put before you what's been marked as
- Plaintiff's Exhibit 3. 16
- 17 THE COURT: You are offering this, right?
- 18 MR. RISK: Yes, your Honor.
- 19 THE COURT: Any objection to 3? That's the offer
- 20 letter, offer letter signed by Ms. Romano, accepted by Ms.
- 21 Kadden. Any objection?
- 22 MS. KLEIN: No, your Honor.
- 23 THE COURT: 3 is received.
- 24 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 received in evidence)
- 25 Turning to the second page of Exhibit 3, there are some

Romano - cross

bullet points listing some job duties, Ms. Romano. You see where it says all new employees are subject to a three-month probationary period and later it says: By that time you will be expected to be at least 50 percent billable, able to fulfill the following job requirements with minimal supervision.

You see that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. The first bullet point: Take direction directly from clients on revisions to existing graphics as well as additional graphics that may be requested.

Is that a skill that Visualex can train someone without experience?

THE COURT: You are asking her that? I'm sorry. Wait a minute. Forget that I said that. That is the correct person to ask. Forget that I said that.

Can you answer that?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

A. What we train our consultants to do is to be able to filter what clients tell them and then decide how you are going to proceed on that. That's the whole thing that I explained going through the graphics is that, yes, part of what we do is we have to make sure that every client, no matter who they talk to --

THE COURT: That wasn't his question. The question is, can you train someone with no experience to do that?

ADT Romano - cross

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

- Q. I'm really going back to Visualex's statement in Exhibit 2
- 3 | that we are willing to train strong candidates. Communicate
- 4 these revisions, additions accurately to the art directors.
- 5 Was that something Visualex can train a strong candidate with
- 6 no prior experience in the field?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Proofread the creative layouts with zero tolerance for
- 9 | errors, that's something Visualex can train a candidate with no
- 10 prior experience?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. Follow-up to ensure that client deadlines and requests are
- 13 met. If the candidate is the appropriate candidate, Visualex
- 14 can train them in that?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. Be sure that you manage client's expectations and
- 17 communicate the urgency of deadlines to the staff. Is that a
- 18 duty that Visualex can train an appropriate candidate with no
- 19 | experience?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Demonstrated ability to proactively provide solutions to
- 22 | unexpected problems that may arise during a project that allow
- 23 a deadline to be met. That skill you can train the appropriate
- 24 | candidate who lacks prior experience?
- 25 A. Honestly, my honest reaction to that is, you can try to

- train somebody, but you have to have a knack for that. Either
 you're a proactive person or you are not. If you're not a
 proactive person, I can't make you be one.
 - Q. How about the next bullet point, provide the requisite leadership and accurate instructions/information to the studio to ensure an efficient flow of work product so that all deadlines can be met using the appropriate amount of billable time. Is that something that Visualex can train an appropriate candidate with no prior experience in the field?
 - A. Again, I think if it's the same thing. I can try to train them. Whether or not they are trainable is a question. So, yes.
 - Q. So a candidate without prior experience in the field could be hired by Visualex and you would attempt to train them in that bullet point?
 - A. Absolutely.
 - Q. Turning to the bullet points in Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, unless I took that away from you, Ms. Romano. I hope I didn't.
 - MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I would like to note my objection to this entire line is calling for speculation.
 - THE COURT: No. She is running the company. I'll allow it.
 - Anyway, it has to do with this whole issue of this so-called requirement. It's not speculation and it is relevant.

Do you have Exhibit 2?

THE WITNESS: Yes. 2

- Q. You see the bullet points, Ms. Romano, below the heading primary responsibilities?
- 5 Α. Yes.

1

3

4

9

10

19

- 6 Look at the first bullet point. I'll read it with you: 7 Read case materials and work with attorneys to identify key case concepts. Is that something Visualex can train a strong 8
 - We can attempt to train them, sure. Α.

candidate without prior experience?

- 11 The next bullet point: Collaborate with our team of 12 designers and animators to execute high-quality, error-free 13 graphics. Is that something that Visualex is willing to train 14 a strong candidate without prior experience in the field?
- 15 Α. Yes.
- And the third one: Schedule trial technicians and 16 17 courtroom equipment, that's something Visualex can train a 18 candidate without prior experience in the litigation graphics field?
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 Finally, project management and client interaction, that's 22 something that Visualex is willing to try to train strong 23 candidates without prior experience in the field?
- 24 Yes. Α.
- You see a little bit below, Ms. Romano, in Exhibit 2, it 25

- This is not, in all capitals, a graphic design position? 1
- 2 Α. Yes.
- 3 There is no dispute that Ms. Kadden is not a graphics
- 4 designer?
- 5 Α. None whatsoever.
- 6 Not trained as one? Ο.
- 7 Α. No.
- Not qualified to be one? 8 Q.
- 9 Α. Right.
- 10 And the graphic designers at Visualex have a different kind Q.
- of education, don't they? 11
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 They have bachelor's degrees in graphics fields? Q.
- 14 Yes. Α.
- 15 Q. And what would those fields be, graphics?
- 16 Α. Design.
- 17 Graphics design, animation? Q.
- 18 Α. Yes.
- Medical illustration? 19 Q.
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 Or related graphics fields? Q.
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 Do all your designers have a degree in graphics or a
- 24 related art field?
- 25 Yes. Α.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Would you high hire someone as a graphic designer who didn't?
- A. I would have to see what they bring to the table.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I would like to note my objection. It's irrelevant. The regs and the statute, it doesn't require that every employee have an advanced degree.

It's why was Ms. Kadden hired. That's what the regulations --

THE COURT: I don't understand most of that argument. It doesn't matter. I don't know. You said the graphic designers?

> MR. RISK: Yes.

THE COURT: Why do I care about the designers?

Because Visualex is arguing the creative MR. RISK: exemption for Ms. Kadden, based on her relationship to the slides, and I'm making a record that she is not a designer and the designers have graphics degrees.

THE COURT: She will right now stipulate that she is not a designer, right?

MS. KLEIN: Correct. She is not a graphic artist.

THE COURT: She is not a graphic artist and they don't have to have a graduate degree.

MS. KLEIN: Maybe some of them.

THE COURT: To the extent it is part of this case because he wants to argue it, some do some don't and she is not a graphic artist or designer.

Romano - cross

1 MS. KLEIN: Correct. 2 Who is Heather Moran? Q. 3 She was a graphic consultant. Α. 4 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I am going to object to this line of questioning. It's irrelevant. 5 6 THE COURT: Overruled. She is the replacement. 7 THE WITNESS: Right. THE COURT: She earns \$75,000 so she doesn't get 8 9 overtime. She is considered by you exempt. We get all that. She has no advanced degree. She is the paralegal. 10 11 THE WITNESS: Right. 12 MR. RISK: Your Honor, you're making it look easy. 13 THE COURT: We should be going faster than we are. 14 I'm not blaming you. Ms. Klein should have gone faster, I 15 should make you go faster, everything should happen faster, but 16 it's not that way today. 17 I am going to try to go a little faster by MR. RISK: 18 giving the witness Exhibits 13 and 14 together. 19 THE COURT: 13 is Ms. Moran's offer letter, right? 20 THE WITNESS: Yes. 21 THE COURT: And 14 is her résumé, right? 22 THE WITNESS: Correct. 23 THE COURT: You are offering both? 24 MR. RISK: Yes.

MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I do object because they are

1 | irrelevant.

2 THE COURT: Overruled. Go ahead. 13 and 14, they are 3 both received.

(Plaintiff's Exhibits 13 and 14 received in evidence)

- Q. You hired Ms. Moran in March of 2011?
- 6 A. Yes.

4

5

7

8

- Q. She started with Visualex within a couple of days after you terminated Ms. Kadden?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Moran had no prior experience in the graphics consulting
- 11 | field?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. She was a paralegal?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. She had no advanced degree?
- 16 | A. No.

18

- Q. You decided, as we discussed, that Ms. Moran was a strong
- 19 A. No. I decided to hire Heather Moran.

candidate that you were willing to train?

- Q. Well, back to Exhibit 2, we prefer applicants with
- 21 experience in the field. We are willing to train strong
- 22 | candidates.
- 23 Ms. Moran had no experience in the field?
- 24 | A. That's correct.
- 25 | Q. So you decided you would train her along the lines we

- discussed?
- 2 I decided to hire her, yes.
- 3 THE COURT: If you hired her you had to train her,
- 4 right.

- 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- You interviewed her? 6 0.
- 7 Α. Yes.
 - You made the hiring decision? Q.
- 9 Α. Yes.
- 10 You told her you would train her? Q.
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 And you thought she was a strong candidate?
- 13 A. You don't know what I thought.
- 14 THE COURT: He is asking that question. He meant to
- 15 say, did you think she was a strong candidate, yes or no?
- THE WITNESS: I thought that she was someone that I 16
- 17 was willing to hire. I don't know that I would consider her a
- 18 strong candidate, but she was someone that I thought that could
- fill a void at that point in time. 19
- 20 Q. Well, you knew that she would have to be trained in your
- 21 field?
- 22 A. Everyone has to be trained in my field.
- 23 THE COURT: Even if they have done it for ten years at
- 24 competing companies?
- 25 They have to be trained the way we do THE WITNESS:

- 1 | it. We do it a little bit differently.
- 2 Q. How do you do it differently?
- 3 A. As I explained previously, the way we separate ourselves is
- 4 | that we are not wrists and we are true consultants, and there
- 5 | is more to it than just being able to regurgitate what a client
- 6 is asking for. You have to be able to assess, evaluate,
- 7 recommend.
- 8 Q. Turning back to Exhibit 2, under qualifications, do you see
- 9 | the bullet point, graduate degree referred, e.g., social
- 10 sciences law, et cetera?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. So Visualex at the time of the search for Ms. Kadden's
- 13 position, Visualex preferred a graduate degree?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 \parallel Q. And examples of the graduate degrees you preferred were law
- 16 and social science?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And there is an et cetera there. What does et cetera mean?
- 19 A. Nicole Matthiesen had a graduate degree in English.
- 20 | Obviously, she is articulate, she can formulate, craft titles,
- 21 | articulate what needs to be communicated, so a graduate degree
- 22 | in a field that is going to give you the skill sets that you
- 23 | need to perform this job.
- 24 | Q. Kim Nawyn's degree, master's degree was in criminal
- 25 | justice?

C8DMKADT Romano - cross

- 1 A. Correct.
- 2 Q. Is that the study of the criminal justice in the penal
- 3 system?
- 4 A. I assume so. I never took a criminal justice, but I assume
- 5 so.
- 6 Q. And is that within the category of graduate degrees that
- 7 | Visualex prefers?
- 8 | A. Yes.
- 9 Q. And how about sociology?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. How about political science?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 | O. How about economics?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 | Q. How about history?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 | Q. How about art history?
- 18 A. I mean, you can name any graduate degree. When I evaluate
- 19 | a candidate, obviously, the graduate degree shows that they
- 20 | have the critical thinking necessary to be able to evaluate
- 21 | materials, understand complex concepts, and come up with ways
- 22 of communicating those complex concepts to the trier of fact.
- 23 | Q. You would consider someone with a Ph.D.?
- 24 A. Of course.
- 25 Q. In natural sciences?

- A. I don't know. I would have to look at the candidate. I can't make this in a vacuum.
- 3 | Q. It would depend on the individual candidate?
- 4 A. Of course.
- Q. And if that candidate had experience in litigation graphics
- 6 consulting, that would be a plus factor?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And if they had the right experience in litigation graphics
- 9 consulting, you might take their Ph.D. in mathematics into
- 10 | account in that context?
- 11 A. I take the entire package into consideration.
- 12 | Q. You're looking at the whole person?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. Education and experience?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. And you prefer experience in the graphics consulting field?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 | Q. And you prefer a graduate degree?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. In Ms. Moran's case you looked at the whole package and
- 21 | found her a good candidate?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 | Q. Even though she had no graduate degree?
- 24 A. She was taking graduate courses, yes. So I thought she was
- 25 advancing her education.

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

Romano - cross

- And no experience in litigation graphics consulting? 1
- 2 But she had experience in the litigation industry, so I Α. 3 thought that was a plus.
- As a paralegal in companies and law firms? 4 Q.
- Uh-huh. And she also had graphics courses as well, so that 5 was another added thing to consider. 6
 - Is Exhibit 3 still before you, Ms. Romano, or should I assist you?
 - Α. I don't think --

10 THE COURT: It's the offer letter to Ms. Kadden.

- I would like you to look at Exhibit 3, Ms. Kadden's offer letter against Exhibit 13, Ms. Moran's offer letter.
- THE COURT: What's the difference, Mr. Risk? They are both in evidence.
 - MR. RISK: They are almost exactly the same.
- THE COURT: Point out the difference to me. 16
- 17 Sorry, your Honor? MR. RISK:
- THE COURT: Point out the difference to me. 18
- The difference is --19 MR. RISK:
- 20 THE COURT: Looks like the two personal days.
- 21 MR. RISK: I think the difference is, real difference
- 22 is on the overtime, your Honor, if you are asking me.
- 23 THE COURT: I am asking you. The documents are in 24 evidence. Personal days and vacation days look different.
- 25 MS. KLEIN: Your Honor, I believe the biggest change

- 1 | is the second paragraph.
- THE COURT: Second paragraph on the first page?
- 3 MS. KLEIN: Yes.
- 4 THE COURT: I see that. Okay.
- Q. Ms. Romano, these offer letters were almost exactly the
- 6 same, aren't they?
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. Ms. Moran was hired for the same position that Ms. Kadden occupied?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- 11 | Q. Ms. Romano, there are two consultants assigned to every
- 12 | matter at Visualex, is that right?
- 13 A. At least two.
- 14 | Q. One performs a lead role, right?
- 15 | A. No.
- 16 | Q. The other provides backup support, right?
- 17 | A. No.
- THE COURT: When there is two assignments, is there
- 19 | any difference between the two?
- 20 THE WITNESS: As I previously testified, one is the
- 21 | primary contact with the attorney who has that name, but that
- 22 | is the purpose of putting the three names, that everybody is
- 23 | smart is on the case. Just like I'm on the case, there is a
- 24 | name that you have to call. If I'm not there, it goes to
- 25 whoever else is there.

4

- 1 MR. RISK: Sorry, your Honor. I have a document on this. 2
 - O. I'd like to show the witness Defendant's Exhibit A.
 - Your Honor doesn't have one. MR. RISK:
- 5 THE COURT: My clerk does. We got books this morning, 6 so it should be okay. Thank you.
- 7 Q. Take a moment, Ms. Romano, to familiarize yourself with
- Exhibit A. Let me know when you are ready for a question. 8
- 9 Α. Okay.
- 10 Exhibit A is a proposal that Visualex prepared for the 11 Stroock law firm, is that right?
- 12 Α. That's correct.
- 13 And it provides a detailed account of the work Visualex 0. 14 does and how it does it?
- 15 A. No. It's in response to a request for a proposal and it's a specific response to the questions that were asked in the 16 17 request for a proposal. It has nothing to do with how we do our work for other clients other than Stroock. 18
- Well, can you look at page VIS 00350, about midway through 19 20 the packet.
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 You prepared Defendant's Exhibit 8, didn't you, Ms. Romano?
- 23 Actually, it was a very collaborative effort. As I recall,
- 24 all of the consultants, myself, Adina, and Kim helped put it
- 25 together, the art directors were involved. It was a huge

undertaking.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Q. Heavily vetted, passed around between a lot of your people.

THE COURT: Obviously, I see that the first sentence on that page says: Two consultants are assigned to every matter, one performed a lead role and the other provided backup support.

THE WITNESS: It's at least two because I only bill for two, but there is actually internally all three consultants are reading the documentation. I just didn't want them to think that I was going to overstaff the case. I am trying to get their work.

THE COURT: I understand.

As bad luck would have it, we do need to stop a little earlier today. Usually we go to 4:30, but we have to stop. See you tomorrow, hopefully at 10:00 tomorrow morning.

(Adjourned to Tuesday, August 14, 2012, at 10:00 a.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ı	
1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	Examination of: Page
3	LILLIAN ROMANO
4	Direct By Ms. Klein
5	Cross By Mr. Risk 145
6	PLAINTIFF EXHIBITS
7	Exhibit No. Received
8	2
9	3
.0	13 and 14
.1	DEFENDANT EXHIBITS
2	Exhibit No. Received
.3	AA
. 4	CC
.5	Y
.6	W
7	Z
.8	C
.9	E
20	G3
21	I and J1 excerpt
22	
23	
24	
25	